

The Social Science Bulletin

October, 1952

Vol. VI, No. 1

EARLY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF MISSISSIPPI: 1699-1840: Background of the Economy by Robert C. Weems, Jr.	1
COUNTY CHAIRMEN AS ELECTION FORECASTERS by William Buchanan and Virginia Zerega	17
HOW NEW WAS THE OLD SOUTH? by John K. Betterswerth	27
NEW REVIEWS OF OLD BOOKS: Jefferson's <u>Notes on Virginia</u> by Robert A. Brent	31
ACTIVITIES	41

Published bimonthly, and distributed gratis by the Social Science Research Center, Mississippi State College, State College, Mississippi. Acceptance under section 34.64 PL&R authorized. Address all communications to Box 148, State College, Miss. Telephone: Starkville 900-Extension 264.

MISSISSIPPI STATE COLLEGE

The Social Science Research Center

EARLY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF MISSISSIPPI: 1699-1840:

I. Background of the Economy

By

Robert C. Weems, Jr.

Editor's Note: This study is the first of a series of articles prepared in connection with an exhaustive study of the Bank of Mississippi completed in 1951 as part of his doctoral dissertation at Columbia University. Inasmuch as the early economic history of the state has been notoriously neglected by historians, it is felt that this particular study should be published. Subsequently, the articles will be bound as a separate bulletin.

Robert C. Weems, Jr. is dean of the School of Business and Industry at Mississippi State College.

INTRODUCTION

The story of the economic evolution of Mississippi in its early years is not easily told. For decades — even centuries — Mississippi was not a well-defined geographic, economic, political, or social unit. In fact, the Mississippi of today only began to be defined when the state as such came into existence in 1817.

This uncoordinated development of early Mississippi was primarily the result of physiographical factors. The major river valleys, the locations of the best fords, and transportation facilities were miles apart and their respective populations, separated by wildernesses and poor roads, settled and developed under varying sets of circumstances. There were times when some of the valleys were actually controlled by different world powers. Because the physiographical limitations were so difficult to overcome, a complete harmony of interests among the people of Mississippi was not established throughout the entire period under review (1699-1840).

About 1798 two political divisions of the state began to stand out: the one along the Mississippi River and closely tied to the old French Colony of Louisiana; the other consisting of the central and eastern portions of the state, which began to develop in the tradition of the American backwoodsman. These geographical divisions, largely the product of physiographical factors, gave rise to such conflicting political factions that some space must be devoted to the background of their development.

Louisiana Ties

The most outstanding physiographical factor was the dominant position occupied by the Mississippi River. This major transportation link was regarded from the earliest days of the French exploration as the southern gateway to the continent.¹ Its unifying influence over all the area later to become Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama, was strongly evident throughout the dominion period. France, England, and Spain, each in turn, were prompted to maintain colonial headquarters at points which were not far distant from its mouth. As interior points were occupied along the Mississippi, they, too, took on the fundamental European character, largely because of their dependence upon the older towns to the south.

¹

Mnnette, History of the Valley of the Mississippi, I, 131-156, 195-244.

Natchez, as an interior settlement under the French, British, and Spanish, was an integral part of the early European colonial development. Founded in 1716,² it grew rapidly under the protecting wing of the French, whose capital was Biloxi (1699-1716); then Mobile (1716-1719); again Biloxi (1719-1723); and finally, New Orleans (1723-1729).³ The tragic experience of Natchez in 1729 shows how dependent it really was. The French capital at New Orleans became unable to maintain military control over the Indians of the interior, and Natchez passed from the scene in one of the greatest massacres in our colonial history.⁴ The city was not reborn until 1764, when the British established Fort Panmure on the site of the ruins of Fort Rosalie. Still, Natchez looked southward for protection and leadership, this time to British headquarters at Pensacola. When the British withdrew after the American Revolution, Natchez looked to the Spanish headquarters at New Orleans for military and economic support.⁵ What was true of Natchez was also true of its hinterland above and below it along the Mississippi River. This strip of river bank became known as the Natchez country, and it was just as much a part of the old Louisiana as were New Orleans, Biloxi, and Mobile.

The affinity of Natchez citizens for the country to the south and the European traditions and customs that prevailed there resulted in the development of a distinct section of the Mississippi Territory: the old established prosperous Natchez country, rich in European heritage. The rest of the Territory was new, untried, and ripe for development in the tradition of the American pioneer. The cleavage between these sections was not strongly evident until 1798, because the Natchez country was completely dominant. With the creation of the Mississippi Territory, a typical American pioneer population began to settle the interior of Mississippi. Then the economic and social differences between these people and the old Natchez residents became increasingly apparent.

Failure to recognize these great disparities became the cause of considerable misunderstanding on the part of the United States officials who set up the Mississippi Territorial government in 1798. It was difficult for them to realize that Natchez was a part of an established country, rather than the crude pioneer settlement that was typical of most of the rest of Mississippi.

It was just as difficult, also, for the residents of the Natchez country, who made up nine tenths of the territorial population, to feel that they should dedicate themselves to the expensive and burdensome task of opening the thousands of square miles of totally undeveloped lands included in the Mississippi Territory and outside the Mississippi River Valley. Since most of Mississippi's proven high grade lands were in Natchez country, and since they could still be acquired at reasonable prices, the unknown and possibly unproductive interior hardly merited the immediate attention of Natchez inhabitants. Why should anyone desire to settle in the untried interior anyway if he could remain in the rich Natchez country and take the fullest advantage of the new cotton-gin prosperity? Yet Natchez had to assume the dominant position in the development of the territory because there simply was no other town available. With its early leadership in population, its advantages of transportation, and its fertile lands, Natchez might have become permanently the dominant city of Mississippi.

² Ibid., I, 214-5.

⁴ Monette, op. cit., I, 260-2.

³ Pickett, History of Alabama, 169-70, 221-3, 231.

⁵ Rowland, History of Mississippi, I, 285-336.

But it assumed its territorial obligations apologetically, condescendingly, and sometimes reluctantly, never being able to accord to any other part of the territory the place in its affections occupied by the Mississippi Valley. The result was that the Natchez country, although quite willing to take commercial advantage of its early superior position, later accepted a less and less important role as the interior sections increased in population and eventually came to dominate the state. Thus the underlying traditions of the later and greater Mississippi ceased to be European and because those of the backwoods, which neither inherited nor borrowed many of the influences, associated with Natchez and the Mississippi Valley.

Natchez Separatism.

The semi-isolation of Natchez from the rest of Mississippi, leads to an explanation of why the Natchez country was unable to extend the influences of the old Louisiana into the central and eastern sections of the state. Natchez had no great natural transportation links with the interior. Only great turnpikes, canals, or railroads could have maintained for Natchez a position of permanent economic and political leadership. None of these facilities were ever employed to any great extent.

Natchez citizens were so highly favored in the commercial advantages offered to them by the convenient Mississippi River they regarded the interior as hardly worth developing. Neither did they wish to bear the heavy developmental expenses which were certain to fall primarily upon the wealthy river counties. In addition, the lands became less and less fertile as their distance from the Mississippi River increased. Why should Natchez residents bother to build up the poor interior country when the situation was so ideal at home? As a result, the only important roads built from Natchez to the interior of Mississippi were two very necessary connecting links with the northern and eastern United States. The more useful was the Natchez Trace, leading to Nashville; the other was the Three Chopped Way, leading to Georgia. No canals were constructed, although some efforts were expended upon making the Big Black River a navigable stream. After 1830, when railroads became a possibility, none of any consequence were built connecting Natchez with the interior.

The semi-isolated position of Natchez and the Natchez country was a major factor in the failure of Mississippi's first great banking institution, the Bank of the State of Mississippi, to establish branches in the interior towns of Mississippi. With no natural transportation links and few artificial ones, the officers of the parent bank in Natchez were faced with the very practical problem of maintaining adequate supervision and control over branches which might have been established in the central and eastern sections. This difficulty, added to a good many others, caused the bank to confine its operations entirely to towns very near the Mississippi River: Natchez, Woodville, Port Gibson, and Vicksburg. The state government of the 1830's, completely dominated by the backwoods sections, had to establish a completely new banking system in order to provide for the credit needs of the entire population. Many of the banks thus established without experience and conservatism proved to be among the worst of the times.

The Backwoods.

When the central and eastern, or backwoods, sections of Mississippi began to develop soon after 1798, common problems caused backwoodsmen to develop a bond which united them in a somewhat jealous opposition to the residents of the Natchez country. The initial growth took place in the strikingly similar valleys of the

Pearl, the Pascagoula, and the Mobile. The valleys all drained directly into the Gulf of Mexico. Their inland population, coming overland from the eastern seaboard of the United States, settled north of 31° north latitude, avoiding the Spanish-dominated country below them. The disadvantages encountered by the settlers were much the same. The quality of the lands they settled was far below that of the lands of the Natchez country, and getting produce into avenues of world trade was an exceedingly difficult and expensive task. Until 1813, heavy excise taxes were levied by the Spanish on trade passing through all the gulf ports of West Florida. Navigational facilities of the Pearl and Pascagoula were unimproved. No heavy duty freight roads connected them with any point on the Mississippi River. The settlers developed a toilsome and independent way of life, which showed little progress until after the removal of the Spanish control of the gulf ports in 1813. As this growth and unity of the backwoods progressed, Natchez did little or nothing to prevent the development of the central and eastern sections along economic, political, and cultural lines quite different from her own.

The most important of the three valleys was that of the Mobile River, including in particular a major tributary, the Tombigbee. The good quality of its bottom lands and the protection against the Indians afforded by United States rule after 1798 enabled it to attract a substantial group of settlers just north of 31° latitude. With the removal of the Spaniards from the gulf coast in 1813, and the end of the Indian wars soon afterward, the valley developed rapidly.⁸ In 1817, just as it was beginning to attract thousands of new settlers annually, most of its area was surrendered to the newly created Alabama Territory.⁹ Following this date the only portion of the valley which figured prominently in the affairs of Mississippi lay along the Tombigbee River. Although the lower Tombigbee was entirely within Alabama, it attracted considerable overland trade from Mississippi.

Had the new state of Mississippi as created in 1817 included the Mobile River Valley with its valuable port of Mobile, that area probably would soon have supplanted the Mississippi River country and Natchez as the dominant part of the state. When Mobile and most of the Mobile River Valley were divorced from Mississippi, the role of challenging the dominance of the Natchez country fell to less able, although determined, hands: the settlers in the valleys of the Pearl and the Pascagoula.

These valleys were almost completely undeveloped at the time of the creation of the Mississippi Territory in 1798. For the next two decades their growth was slow. Neither river was readily navigable except at flood stages, and much improvement would have been required in order to make them so. The needed public works never materialized, thanks in part to the apathy of the Mississippi Valley area. The inhabitants of the Pearl and Pascagoula valleys, suffering from poor roads and Spanish excises, remained for years almost as poor as they were on their arrival. In contrast with the prosperous Mississippi Valley planters, they were a poverty stricken lot; yet their numbers continued to increase. By 1821, their combined political power was greater than that of the Natchez country. As to why the new immigrants were choosing to settle in the less productive valleys, rather than in the Natchez country, probably the answer lies in the fact that in the latter place, capital was required for a start. Also, educational limitations of the newcomers caused them to feel out of place there. Ignorant settlers on the

⁸ Hamilton, Colonial Mobile, 409-15.

⁹ Ibid., 451-67.

Pearl or the Pascagoula could earn a livelihood and did not have to compare their positions with the pretentious nabobs of the Mississippi Valley. Another source of some satisfaction was the knowledge that with the increase in their numbers, these settlers could some day control the politics of the state. When that became a reality, they might even call on the rich Natchez country to pay for many of the improvements which the newer sections needed but had never been able to afford.

One way in which these interior sections attempted to make use of the wealth of the Natchez country was by requesting the able Bank of the State of Mississippi to establish branches in the central and eastern towns. This the bank's directorate, which was unable to see beyond its Natchez nose, steadfastly refused to do, arousing a uniform opposition on the part of most of the citizens outside the Mississippi River Valley. This opposition was justly deserved, particularly in 1831, when the Mississippi River area was being served by the bank of the State of Mississippi and also by the Natchez office of the Bank of the United States. In contrast to these fine banking establishments, the central and eastern sections, which actually excelled in population, had no banks or branch offices of any description; nor had they ever enjoyed any type of local banking accommodations. There is little wonder that from 1825 through 1831 their representatives in the state legislature strongly supported a plan calling for a new bank in Mississippi.

The abovementioned conflicts of dominion and politics and of economic and social life seem never to have resolved themselves in Mississippi early history. If their existence is constantly borne in mind, the mere detailed accounts which follow will prove to be much more meaningful.

II. DOMINIONS AND POWERS

The early political evolution of Mississippi was conditioned by two factors: (1) the conquest of the Indians, which was participated in with equal enthusiasm by Spain, France, England, and the United States; and (2) the intense military rivalries, both local and world-wide, involving these same powers in a contest for colonial title and control.

The conquest of the Indians was at first the more important consideration, for without the elimination of the red man, permanent colonization could not take place. Even with the coming of the British forces to re-establish the defunct community at Natchez in 1764, the presence of Indians limited the amount of usable land to that near Fort Panmure, on the site of the old Fort Rosalie. Thirty-four years elapsed before the United States government began to make arrangements with the Indians whereby extensive settlement of the interior was permitted. Even so, there was another period of thirty-four years before white men were permitted to acquire lands everywhere in the state. The second development was important in determining the legal, economic, and political institutions of the settlers; for internal affairs nearly always followed the pattern of the country currently in control. These two factors are almost inseparable, inasmuch as each of the Indian nations was invariably allied with some European power; hence they will be discussed together in the account which follows.

Four periods of foreign control in the Southwest may be recognized: Spain, 1541-1673; France, 1673-1763; England, 1763-1781; and Spain, 1781-1798. Of course, there were times during each period when the dominions were weakly or incompletely maintained, but many of the details must go unmentioned in a brief summary designed to show only a broad pattern of events.

Spanish Exploration.

The first Spanish period was one of mere exploration. The first Europeans to set foot in the area of the Mississippi were DeSoto, the Spanish conqueror, and his military escorts. In 1541 he entered northeast Alabama, where the Coosa River crosses the present boundary of Alabama and Georgia, and described a wandering path westward reaching the Mississippi River a few miles below what is now Memphis, Tennessee. His expedition ended tragically, but he had shown what armed force could do in a land of primitive people. Perhaps he found himself in a situation where only wholesale slaughter could save him. In any event, the memory of his murderous march lingered on in the legends of the tribes until the coming of the French explorers more than a hundred years later. His explorations were not followed through by the Spanish, and the areas he charted were among the very last in the Mississippi Territory to be opened for settlement by the white man. In general, the economic value of his expedition seems to have been almost nothing. According to Rowland, it "supplied little knowledge of real value to the world nor yielded fruit of any kind except as a contribution to the romantic exploits of the day."¹⁰

French Dominion.

The French period began in 1673 with Marquette, a French missionary, and Joliet, a French businessman, who beginning their travels in the Illinois country, descended the Mississippi River to the mouth of the Arkansas, but decided to go no further because of the risk.¹¹ Their voyage, however, marks the beginning of French influence, which was to remain dominant in the Southwest for a century. In 1682, LaSalle, accompanied by "the brave Tonti, a Franciscan Father, 23 Frenchmen, 18 Indian men, 10 squaws and 3 children, all of approved courage and intelligence," went all the way to the mouth of the Mississippi, visiting along the way the Chickasaws, Tensas, Choctaws, and the Natchez Indians.¹² He was authorized to build forts along the river but did not do so. Later he returned to the lower Mississippi country by sea, a plan which went afoul on the coast of Texas and resulted in his death.¹³

Positive establishment of French military control came in 1699 with the founding of Fort Maurepas on the eastern shore of the Bay of Biloxi, near the present location of Ocean Springs, Mississippi. The fort was needed more for protection against other European nations than against the local Biloxi Indians, who were friendly. About Fort Maurepas there grew a poor struggling little colony, starting with less than two hundred civilians, including a few women and children. It was the first successful attempt in the French colonization of Louisiana.¹⁴

In 1702 Fort Louis De la Mobile, near the present city of Mobile, was made the capital, and the bulk of the population soon began to transfer there.¹⁵ The colony grew very slowly, however, and hardships were many. By 1712 there were only 324 persons in Louisiana. They were "scattered over the colony" from Mobile to the Bay of St. Louis and separated by large rivers and expansive lakes.¹⁶ In 1716, with the French capital still at Fort Louis De la Mobile, military control

¹⁰ Rowland, History of Mississippi, I, 122.

¹¹ J. Pickett, op. cit., 160.

¹² Rowland, History of Mississippi, I, 126.

¹³ Ibid., I, 130.

¹⁴ Ibid., I, 146-64.

¹⁵ Pickett, op. cit., 170.

¹⁶ Ibid., 186.

was extended up the Mississippi River to Natchez, where Fort Rosalie was established.¹⁷ The Natchez area had exceedingly fine lands but was in the heart of the dwelling place and hunting grounds of the quick-tempered Natchez Indians. Many settlers thought that the fort gave adequate protection and they moved to the Natchez country in large numbers. In 1719 the military capital of Louisiana was transferred from Mobile back to Biloxi, largely for military security from the Spanish at Pensacola.¹⁸ Mobile continued as a settlement, but Biloxi became the major center of activity, as the headquarters of John Law's Western Company, then engaged in the promotion of the colony.¹⁹ The flow of settlers to the Natchez country became much more rapid as military and economic resources were poured into the colony.²⁰

In 1723 New Orleans became the permanent capital of Louisiana. Natchez was thought by some to be a better location, but Bienville, himself, had selected the site of New Orleans, and his wishes prevailed.²¹ Governing districts were established, those making up the area later occupied by the area later occupied by the Mississippi Territory being designated as Natchez, Yazoo, Biloxi, and Mobile.²²

The immediate prospect of a brilliant economic future for the Natchez country was terminated tragically in 1729. Unsatisfactory relations between the French commandant at Natchez and the nearby Natchez Indians culminated in a perfectly organized Indian attack upon the fort, which resulted in the massacre of virtually every male European in the area, over 200 in number.²³

The Natchez tragedy made one thing clear to the French: their control over the Indians would have to be complete if they were going to settle the interior. They immediately began a series of attacks against the Natchez tribe, virtually annihilating it by 1732.²⁴ By that time, evidence was beginning to accumulate which indicated that only an error in timing had kept the Chickasaws, another nearby Indian nation, from participating in the Natchez massacre.²⁵ In 1736 the French under the military leadership of Bienville began a series of attacks against the Chickasaws, into whose tribe some Natchez Indians had fled. The Europeans made a very poor showing, and in a campaign lasting into 1740 they were totally unable to defeat the Chickasaws. One cause, no doubt, was the assistance rendered the Chickasaws by the British from the north.²⁶ A ten-year stalemate followed, during which time the "settlements of Louisiana were comparatively free of Indian hostilities."²⁷ In 1750, the old troubles were revived and a series of conflicts involving the Indians, the colonies, and the mother countries continued until the virtual destruction of French power in the new world was completed by 1763.²⁸

During the time the French were attempting unsuccessfully to establish military control over the interior, they gradually concentrated their principal settlements about New Orleans, the Gulf Coast, and Mobile. The rich Natchez

¹⁷ Monette, op. cit., I, 214-5.

¹⁸ Rowland, History of Mississippi, I, 205.

¹⁹ Ibid., 221.

²⁰ Ibid., 219-20.

²¹ Monette, op. cit., I, 238.

²² Ibid., I, 246.

²³ Ibid., I, 254-62

²⁴ Monette, op. cit., I, 263-74.

²⁵ Claiborne, op. cit., 43.

²⁶ Monette, op. cit., I, 277-93.

²⁷ Ibid., I, 294.

²⁸ Ibid., I, 298-308.

country, which might have been considered reasonably secure after the defeat of the Natchez Indians, was not resettled.²⁹

The effect of the Seven Years' War was to leave France almost destitute and unable to defend her colonial possessions. In 1763, under the Treaty of Paris, she transferred to England all her possessions east of the Mississippi River with the exception of the city of New Orleans. New Orleans, which was almost totally French in character, and the country west of the Mississippi, went to the Spanish.³⁰ The British established their capital at Pensacola. Many French at Mobile and along the Gulf coast took the oath of allegiance to Great Britain; others retreated disappointedly to New Orleans, then in Spanish hands, but still the city that represented to them the glory that once belonged to France. Thus ended the great period of French dominion. Most of its permanent influence centered in New Orleans, and the settlements along the west side of the lower Mississippi, but there it remained to establish a very strong bond with those Frenchmen who became British subjects. For years to come there was an affinity between the people of Natchez, New Orleans, the Mississippi gulf coast, and Mobile. That between Natchez and New Orleans was enhanced by the flow of river trade between the two points and by the proximity of French laws and customs directly across the river from Natchez.³¹

British Rule.

The British period saw rapid development. The English proceeded to open up the Natchez country as soon as possible, rechristening Fort Rosalie with the name of Fort Panmure in 1764.³² Although they may have had little to fear from Indian attack, the Natchez Indians being no longer present, the British proceeded with diplomacy and caution to acquire from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians the rights to the lands they were about to occupy. This was not a difficult diplomatic project because the Indians were rapidly coming to appreciate the advantages of trade with the European nations. The lands ceded to the British were, roughly speaking, those south of a line extending from the Mississippi River at a point about forty miles above Natchez to the Tombigbee River at a point about seventy miles above Mobile.³³

With freedom from attack guaranteed and with the British anxious to settle the area largely with a view toward permanent colonization and trade, the growth of the Natchez country was extremely rapid. Land grants were freely made, the most extensive going to British subjects, many of whom were retired officers of the British army.³⁴ Consequently, the new Natchez had a distinct British character, and during the Revolutionary War, it was predominantly a British colony, although not entirely without sympathy for the Americans.³⁵ The two most distinctive characteristics of the period of British control were a whole-hearted devotion on the part of the new residents to agricultural pursuits, and a tremendous trade expansion into every prospective channel, led in particular by large British trading enterprises such as Swanson and Company.³⁶

²⁹ Rowland, History of Mississippi, I, 261.

³¹ Rowland, History of Mississippi, I, 261.

³³ Rowland, History of Mississippi, I, 261-2.

³⁵ Ibid., I, 408.

³⁰ Monette, op. cit., I, 306-7.

³² Claiborne, Mississippi, 102.

³⁴ Monette, op. cit., I, 405-406.

³⁶ Claiborne, op. cit., 105-6, 115-6.

Spanish Dominion.

Spanish rule began officially at the end of the Revolutionary War, when England ceded to the United States government its lands east of the Mississippi River. Already Spain had assumed control by conquest of the inhabited areas, including Natchez and the Gulf Coast.³⁷ From 1779 until 1798, what is now the State of Mississippi was directly subject to the Spanish government of Louisiana, which had established its headquarters at New Orleans.³⁸ The Spanish claimed permanent right of possession by conquest to all of Florida. A dispute arose as to the northern boundary of Florida, which Britain had once set at 32° 30' latitude, but which both England and the United States now insisted was 31°, a line which would have freed Natchez from Spanish control and given it to the United States.³⁹ Although agreeing in 1795 to evacuate down as far as 31°, the Spanish remained in control of the Natchez country until 1798. Only after the West Florida Revolution in 1810 did they begin to lose control of the area below 31°, finally being driven from Mobile in 1813.⁴⁰

The Spaniards, from the very first, were extremely cooperative with the former citizens of Great Britain and with immigrants coming from the eastern seaboard states. So determined were they to maintain the successful economy begun by Britain that their attitude impressed favorably the former British subjects, whose property rights were completely recognized.⁴¹ For example, William Dunbar, a former British subject, found the Spanish government entirely satisfactory.⁴²

Colonial Legal Systems.

The legal system during each period of European domination was that of the country in military control. Any possibility that the French legal system would become the foundation of Mississippi law disappeared in 1763, when the French retreated to New Orleans to leave their other lands east of the Mississippi to the British. Their legal system had some influence on the residents of the Natchez country, who had extensive land holdings across the Mississippi River and operated plantations there. Some of the earliest of the Natchez newspapers carried legal notices in French. This small influence of the French legal system upon Mississippi never completely ended, but its effect diminished with the decline of Natchez as the major political and economic center of the state.

The British legal system, introduced into the West Florida provinces in 1763, eventually became the foundation of the legal system of Mississippi. The British settlers of 1763-1781 were familiar with the workings of the common law. They were extremely cognizant of the importance of commercial enterprises, especially in connection with trade, a factor which must have been instrumental in extending and permanently implanting their legal system. The British utilized treaties extensively in their dealings with the Indians, and their success in so doing probably contributed to the confidence of both red men and white men in British legal institutions.

³⁷ Monette, *op. cit.*, I, 458-9.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, I, 457-537.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, I, 494.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, I, 513, 531; II, 389.

⁴¹ Claiborne, *op. cit.*, 135-40.

⁴² William Dunbar to John Ross, December 29, 1781, December 22, 1782, in Letter Book of William Dunbar.

The Spanish legal system of 1779-1798 was superimposed upon inhabitants and legal institutions which were predominately British. It was characterized by fees, which were payable to public officials for various services, including the rendering of decisions. The Spaniards were extremely tolerant of the legal rights of the former settlers in the area who had acquired lands and property under British grants. So considerate were they, that hundreds of new settlers of British ancestry came into the Natchez country during the period of Spanish dominion. Although the old and new British settlers were not permitted to continue under the laws with which they were familiar, they seemed to have no particularly serious grievances against the Spanish system, and legal problems were at a minimum. The Spanish were quick and thorough in the enforcement of the provisions of wills and testaments and in seeing that contracts were duly executed. Indeed, the British took rather complete advantage of the situation by combining their knowledge of their own legal system with what they were daily learning about the Spanish system. The Spaniards, being particularly anxious not to offend their British subjects, found themselves granting petitions by the score. Examples of such petitions were requests for moratoria on debt payments, exemption from taxes, and larger subsidies on agricultural products.⁴³ Many Spanish court records--deeds, wills, and other documents--remain in the local legal archives of the Natchez country. They have been recognized in their entirety and today constitute a body of titular records which forms the basis of property holdings throughout a large portion of south Mississippi.⁴⁴

The fact that most of the English settlers remained on through the period of Spanish occupancy no doubt had its effect in establishing the British legal system as the basic one for the Mississippi Territory. Their preference for the British system combined with the fact that the United States laws which were imposed upon them were also largely of British origin, caused the Spanish legal customs and ideas to give way completely. Certainly the United States system, begun in the Territory by the early Federal judges, and largely British in origin, was thoroughly acceptable to practically all of the local citizens.

U. S. Rule.

The United States period began in 1798, immediately following the eviction of the Spanish from the Natchez country. The Mississippi Territory was established on April 7, and Natchez became the first territorial capital.⁴⁵ Excluded from the territorial limits were the northern halves of Mississippi and Alabama, still in possession of the Indians; and the Gulf Coast country south of 31° latitude, including Bay St. Louis, Biloxi, and Mobile, all of which were still in possession of the Spanish.⁴⁶ Thus the territory, as originally created, was a narrow rectangle extending east from the Mississippi River across the southern halves of the present states of Mississippi and Alabama to the Chattahoochee. Spanish control of the coastal area and the difficulties of overland transportation caused this inland strip, with the exception of the Natchez country, to have very little economic value until 1813. The Mississippi River offered a comparatively free avenue of trade but one that benefited only the western part of the territory.

The city of Natchez and its neighboring districts were the most populous and economically advanced portion of the newly created Mississippi Territory of 1798. Although the size of the territory was increased in 1804 so that it em-

⁴³ Claiborne, op. cit., p. 135-40.

⁴⁴ Rowland, History of Mississippi, I, 294-301, 304, 311-312.

⁴⁵ Rowland, History of Mississippi, I, 341.

⁴⁶ U.S. Statutes (Peters' Comp.), I, 549-50, Act of April 7, 1798.

braced the entire area of the present states of Mississippi and Alabama above 31° Natchez continued to occupy the dominant position.⁴⁷ There were few white settlers in the newly acquired northern half; nor could this area be settled until the United States offered for sale the lands then in possession of the Indians. The three south central interior sections, the valleys of the Pearl, Pascagoula, and the Mobile-Tombigbee, all suffering great disadvantages, were growing very slowly. Their fertility ranged from fair to good, but transportation difficulties detracted greatly from the value of their products. The Spanish blocked the mouths of the rivers and there were no connecting freight roads to Natchez. As one moved eastward from the small group of settlers in the Pearl River Valley, the white population dwindled to nothing, to recover slightly in the upper valleys of the Pascagoula-Leaf-Chickasawhay river system. After that it dropped to nothing again to recover finally and more completely when the Tombigbee River Valley was reached.

In 1813, the removal of the Spanish from the Gulf Coast liberated these inland valley settlements. The territorial government soon embraced the coastal country and thus came to include practically all of the area of the present states of Alabama and Mississippi. Population was still heavily concentrated about Natchez, and Washington, a little town six miles east of Natchez, continued to serve as the territorial capital, a distinction it had held since 1802.

From the standpoint of the inhabitants of the Mobile Valley, Washington was a most inconvenient location for the seat of government. It was two hundred miles away by very poor overland travel accommodations. This sentiment protesting against Washington was duplicated in the upper Tombigbee country, and in a new rapidly developing population center around Huntsville. It was felt to some extent even in the Pascagoula-Leaf-Chickasawhay Valley, the inhabitants of which were attracted toward the Tombigbee River and to Mobile, because of the poor navigational facilities at the mouth of the Pascagoula.

On March 1, 1817, the state of Mississippi was created, and the Alabama Territory was formed from the eastern part of the Mississippi Territory.⁴⁸ Population in the Alabama Territory began to increase rapidly and spread uniformly, but in Mississippi the most important Indian lands of the north were not offered for sale until the 1830's. For most practicable purposes Mississippi, during its early years, consisted of that portion of the present state south of and including the sites of the present cities of Vicksburg, Jackson, and Meridian. The Natchez country continued to hold its position as the most important economic and political section until 1821. In that year the substantial number of new settlers in the central and eastern sections brought a removal of the state capital permanently to Jackson in the Pearl River Valley. Although surrendering its political position, Natchez retained its economic leadership for many years after 1821. The Bank of the State of Mississippi, with its home office in Natchez, was one of the major agencies which were instrumental in maintaining the town as the financial and economic center of Mississippi.

Of tremendous economic and political significance to Mississippi were the Treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek, made with the Choctaw Indians in 1830,⁴⁹ and the Treaty of Pontotoc with the Chickasaws in 1832.⁵⁰ By these treaties the Indians agreed to move west of the Mississippi River. The entire area of Mississippi was now open to white settlement, and the state could henceforth exist as an integrated political unit.

⁴⁷ U.S. Statutes (Peters' Comp.), II, 283, Act of Feb. 24, 1804.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, I, 555-556.

⁴⁸ Rowland, *History of Mississippi*, I, 484-5.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, I, 579-580.

III. INTERNAL POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

One thing which stands out in the social and economic history of early Mississippi is the intense internal political activity which prevailed. Local citizens displayed an extreme adroitness in the art of influencing affairs of state which carried over well with the period of early statehood. Actually this political sense had been developing for years, even dating back to the establishment of the first colony on the Bay of Biloxi in 1699. A few preliminary comments concerning some of the problems of the early colonies may serve as an indication of how the growth of this skill took place.

Colonial Politics.

The major colonial decisions were almost invariably made in Europe, thousands of miles from the people who were affected. Meanwhile, local citizens attempted to stand in with the home government and with the European favorites of little ability who were sent to govern their colonies.

In the first French colony, there was a continual play among the leaders for popularity both at home and in Europe. In 1717, in order to "prevent the struggle for power which never failed to display itself between the former governor, commissaries and officers of the colony, the King of France, by written instructions defined the duties of each."⁵¹ This was no permanent solution, however, and governing officials continued to be appointed and replaced by the crown with little regard for the work they had begun or the effect on the colony that a change might have. The local citizens, in an effort to cultivate favoritism from the factions in control, became a part of the petty system. The fact that most settlers sought to get along through governmental assistance and without resorting to more practical pursuits placed a high premium on friendship with the proper officials. Throughout the terms of Crozat's monopoly (1711-1718), the Western Company (1718-1732), and the later French period, (1732-1763), those colonists who were clever enough to become political favorites received their economic rewards in the forms of grants of land, special privileges at the local commissaries and warehouses, and deliberate oversight of their engagement in the forbidden but highly profitable trade with the Spanish.⁵²

Under the British, the larger land grants were dispensed as political favors, particularly to those who had influence in the mother country. Large British commercial firms received highly profitable trading privileges and continual assistance from the home government. As for the political intrigues in connection with British trade, there are few in history so involved as the deep intrigues of McGillivray. In this instance, even international lines were transcended as one important trader attempted to shift allegiances among Americans, British, and Spaniards, using his grip on the Indian trade as a bargaining factor.⁵³

After the occupation by the Spanish began in 1781, the local inhabitants, largely British in origin, became still more adept in the art of politics. It was plain that the stakes of land ownership and continued favors at the King's warehouse were tremendously high. It was good business to remain on friendly

⁵¹ A. J. Pickett, op. cit., 178-80, 188-208, 209-10.

⁵² Rowland, History of Mississippi, I, 194, 199-200, 220-22, 236-48.

⁵³ Pickett, op. cit., pp. 385-407.

terms with the officials of the Spanish, British, and United States governments. The actions of William Dunbar, who after 1785 was a citizen of the area that was to become the Mississippi Territory, afford an example of the position a well-meaning resident was forced to take. He was residing near Baton Rouge in 1781, when the Spanish assumed control. His own conclusion as to the relative values of the different governments was expressed as follows: "I shall have no objection to live under a Spanish or any other well regulated government..."⁵⁴

As dominions came and went, land grants multiplied. The question as to who owned land became even more involved, politically, beginning in 1789, when the State of Georgia began to sell certain parts of the area later to become the Mississippi Territory. These lands were designated as part of Bourbon County, which had been officially created by the Georgia legislature in 1785 to embrace the lands ceded by the British to the United States following the Revolutionary War. Georgia's claim to the lands was valid enough, but her hasty action was embarrassing to almost everyone concerned. The land was sold in large blocks directly to "companies," and it included areas then under the military possession of the Spanish. Thus a possessor under Spanish law might find his land owned by someone else under Georgia law. These sales also came at a time when the United States and Spain were conducting negotiations in connection with their own conflicting claims to the area.⁵⁵ In spite of United States requests of Georgia to stop the sales, more were made in 1794 and 1795.⁵⁶

Territorial Politics.

The political sense which the colonists had been steadily acquiring throughout colonial days achieved full maturity soon after the Mississippi Territory was created on April 7, 1798. Local citizens, including some who had moved in bearing Georgia titles, began a political fight to retain their holdings, some of which were extensive. Lands were destined to increase greatly in value because the most of them could be converted into cotton production as rapidly as ginning facilities could be acquired. The people feared that the land ownership question had become so involved that it might now become possible for the local land commissioners to re-allocate titles upon a basis of political favoritism. The major questions of the day became: Would the Spanish grants be recognized by the United States? Would purchases of the lands sold by Georgia take precedence over former owners of long residence? Would lands acquired under the British still belong to the possessor of the title? Would absentee ownership under the British and Spanish be recognized? All these questions were unanswered as the people, who were predominantly Republicans, presented their pleas before a board of Federalist land commissioners.

Anthony Hutchins, one of the holders of very extensive lands, wrote on January 25, 1799: "Courts are not yet organized, nor do we know anything respecting lands, whether British grants for unoccupied lands will operate fully here or not, or whether Spanish grants on the same land will not bear greater weight. These are matters I suppose that will ere long be determined. One of the evasions respecting the English grants is that Florida was in the possession of Spain when the Treaty

⁵⁴ William Dunbar to John Ross, December 29, 1781, in Letter Book of William Dunbar.

⁵⁵ Pickett, op. cit., 408-15.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 445-59.

between Britain and America was made and established."⁵⁷ William Dunbar, who resided near Natchez during much of the Spanish occupancy, served as a conservator of the peace in Adams County in 1798 and as a member of the court of general quarter sessions in 1799.⁵⁸ He listed 23 separate types of authorizations under which the citizens laid claim to their lands.⁵⁹ Thomas Rodney, one of the "Commissioners of the Board West of the Pearl River," was quite concerned over the important question of the recognition of Spanish titles.⁶⁰

While tenseness prevailed, the people wanted their governor to announce immediately a policy equitable to all landholders. Unfortunately, Winthrop Sargent did not have the good sense to try to understand their wishes. A Federalist, he was sent as Governor of the Mississippi Territory primarily because he was "an experienced and brave military officer." The territory was recognized as a danger spot partly because of its background of foreign rule and partly because of its being a military outpost adjoining Spanish lands. Sargent's other qualifications were apparently not outstanding, but he was a "man of education and fair character." He did not particularly want the job, but being denied the governorship of the territory north of the Ohio, he accepted.⁶¹

Almost immediately after his arrival, the local citizens pressed Sargent for definite statements which would give them some ideas as to what their next moves should be. No executive could have been expected to weigh immediately the relative merits of all the questions posed by the citizens. Unfortunately, the natural disposition of Governor Sargent was such as to cause the people to fear that they might never receive a fair and equitable hearing. In this respect, William Dunbar, an owner of many acres under British and Spanish grants, describes Sargent's character:

I am upon as good terms as it is possible to be with the man of the phlegmatic, frigid and austere disposition of Governor Sargent; however good his inclination may be to do what is just, lawful, and equitable or even praise-worthy, it is impossible that a mind so rigid and inflexible can give satisfaction to a free people..... It is on this account that a body of our inconsiderate citizens already manifest a disposition to be dissatisfied with everything done by the Governor...he knows not how to be gracious and all the lower class say he is haughty.⁶²

Had Sargent been of a more amicable temperament--as was Holmes, who became governor a decade later--he might have satisfied most of the people with a gentle assurance that all their just claims would be enforced by his administration. As a public servant Sargent was reasonably conscientious, energetic, and patriotic in the discharge of responsibilities placed upon him, although his Federalism and his

⁵⁷ Anthony Hutchins to John Miller, January 25, 1799, quoted in Rowland, Mississippi, I, 913.

⁵⁸ Rowland, Mississippi Official and Statistical Register, 1908, 11.

⁵⁹ William Dunbar to John Ross, May 23, 1799, in Letter Book of William Dunbar.

⁶⁰ Thomas Rodney to Caesar Rodney, February 18, 1805, Rodney Letters, Library of Congress.

⁶¹ Clarence Carter, ed., Territorial Papers of the U. S., V, 31.

⁶² William Dunbar to John Ross, May 23, 1799.

New England training made him unpopular amid the democracy of the frontier and involved him in many unpleasant controversies.⁶³

Sargent's suspicious attitude toward practically every citizen, including some of many years residence who could have helped him and who could also have sympathized with his Federalist beliefs, added fuel to the conflagration, which was rapidly consuming his chances of becoming a successful governor. Because he was unable to appraise the local situation, he answered few questions, the foremost unanswered one being that concerning the lands. Those questions which Sargent did answer seemed to have been conditioned by the ordinances of the Northwest Territory, with which he was familiar, and not adapted to conditions and public opinion in the Mississippi Territory. He was removed from office in 1801 by the newly elected Republican President, Thomas Jefferson, as a result of a petition circulated against him by the inhabitants.⁶⁴

The land questions were still unanswered when the local Republicans themselves split into two factions in 1805. One group was called the Claiborne party because of its loyalty to the Republican governor who had succeeded Sargent; and the other was called the West party, because of its support of Cato West, Secretary of the Mississippi Territory and Acting Governor following the departure of W. C. C. Claiborne to New Orleans about March 2, 1805, to become governor of the newly created Louisiana Territory. The new Governor, Robert Williams, was not acceptable to the West faction, who wanted their leader made Governor.⁶⁵ Into the gap stepped a small handful of Federalists who were still quite unhappy over the enforced removal of their fellow party member, Sargent, from his position as governor. They managed to bring about a complete deadlock in the legislative machinery of the territory. As explained by Judge Rodney, the whole legislature was composed of 5 legislative counselors and 9 representatives. Of the total of 14, only 4 were denominated Federalists but they were all in the House of Representatives. The method of choosing members to the Legislative Council, or upper house, was for the governor to submit to the President of the United States the names of two individuals from each county, from which the President would select one. This might have been a simple thing had not it also been necessary for the original list of names to be selected by the House of Representatives. Naturally, having four of the nine members in the lower house, the Federalists were in a very powerful position and, aided by the split among the Republican members, they successfully blocked the reappointment of a new Legislative Council until 1809.

The position of the governor was, of course, one of great embarrassment. Moreover, he was not the type of person by disposition who could bring together the dissenting groups. Much of the blame for the political troubles of the state was directed toward him, just as had been the case in 1800, when critics succeeded in deposing Governor Sargent. A traveler who spent the fall of 1808 in the Mississippi Territory was particularly impressed by the state of political affairs. He said: "I forbear giving my opinion of the governor, as the curse of party pervades this territory, as well as every other part of the United States, and any opinion of a public character, would not fail to offend one or the other party."⁶⁶

⁶³ Dictionary of American Biography, XVI, 368-69.

⁶⁴ Claiborne, op. cit., pp. 202-19.

⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 258.

⁶⁶ Alexander Cuming, "Tour to the Western Country," in Reuben Gold Thwaites, ed., Early Western Travels, 1748-1846 (Cleveland: Arthur H. Clark Co., 1904-1907), IV, 324.

Settlement of the questions relating to land titles could have done much to relieve the political situation, yet little was accomplished. The board of three commissioners, which had jurisdiction in the matter, underwent frequent changes, and its members also had other pressing responsibilities. On April 6, 1805, the Board consisted of Thomas Rodney, who was also a Federal judge; Robert Williams, who had just been appointed Governor; and the Governor's brother, Thomas H. Williams, who had been selected but was still awaiting his official letters of appointment. Judge Rodney feared that the tackling of the land question would be delayed beyond "December next."⁶⁷ Actually, it proved to be several years before the land controversies were settled, but in the end nearly every claimant was satisfied.

Beginning about mid-year, 1809, political strife suddenly waned in the Mississippi Territory. The major land questions had been cleared and the principles which had been used in solving them proved generally acceptable to all concerned. Governor Williams had resigned, the deadlock of the Federalists had been broken, a new Legislative Council had been chosen, and the people were being united militarily under the threat of war in their area involving a stand against the Spanish, the French, the British, or the Indians. The new governor, David Holmes, enjoyed a happy position throughout the remainder of the territorial period, and for the first years following the admission of Mississippi to statehood in 1817.

Early State Politics.

The collapse of this political peace came in the twenties. It was the time of the Jacksonian upsurge in national politics, and in Mississippi the national issues of democracy against conservatism aligned the backwoods against the Natchez district. As more and more land was taken away from the Indians, the preponderance of the backwoods element increased. In 1821, the state capital was removed to the interior, to Jackson, at the insistence of the backwoods area. With the Indian treaties of 1830 and 1832, the last obstructions to white settlement of the interior were removed. Lands in the northern half of Mississippi were offered for sale by the Federal government, the action being preceded by great celebrations throughout the state. Settlers began to pour in from every direction. Local politicians and business men speculated heavily in lands which they hoped to resell with great profits to themselves.

The Whigs of Natchez soon saw their fate sealed. The conservative state constitution of 1817 was liberalized in 1832. The new counties to the north were, despite a delaying action from the Whigs, soon making their influence felt in state politics. Economic restraints fell along with political restraints, and unbridled speculation ensued. The popular banks of the 1830's made for much easy money. Mississippi's economy, like its land area, soon doubled. The inevitable result was the crash of 1837. Even depression did not unseat the unterrified Democracy of Mississippi; and in the forties and fifties the backwoodsmen went on to such radical measures as bond repudiation. At any rate, the backwoods had triumphed, and the Natchez conservatives were humiliated.

⁶⁷

Thomas Rodney to Caesar Rodney, April 6, 1805, Caesar and Thomas Rodney Collection.

County Chairmen as Election Forecasters

by

William Buchanan and Virginia V. S. Zerega

NOTE: This study was conducted by Mr. Buchanan and Miss Zerega as a project of the Office of Public Opinion Research, of Princeton University. The American Institute of Public Opinion made available their files of election data and advised in the formulation of the study. The Social Science Research Center is happy to have the opportunity to issue the study in *Social Science Studies* (Government Series No.5) and in the *Social Science Bulletin*, and wishes to thank Dr. Hadley Cantril, director of the Office of Public Opinion Research for permission to publish the findings, and Dr. George Gallup, director, and Messrs. Emory Ruby, Samuel Howell, Robert Courson, and Paul Perry, staff members of the American Institute of Public Opinion, for their invaluable assistance. Since completing this study, Mr. Buchanan has become a member of the staff of the Social Science Research Center at Mississippi State College.

I. THE PROBLEM

When are "personal," "subjective," "experienced" judgments of a social situation more accurate than the "impartial," "objective," "quantitative" appraisals of disinterested outsiders? This question is basic to many applications of "social science" to public policy, for governmental personnel have turned with increasing frequency from intuitive to methodical analysis of the behavior of the public with which they are concerned.¹

In one small field, that of election forecasting, it is possible to make some pertinent comparisons between the estimates of political workers in an area with which they are familiar, and those of "scientific" or (if that word is too pretentious) "systematic" methods. Of the latter, two are in general use. One, depending largely on sampling theory, is used by the public opinion polls. The other, "trend forecasting," depends on the consistency of voter habits, the likelihood that relationships which have held in the past will continue to hold true, or will modify slowly and at a steady rate, or will follow cycles.

Theoretically, the two principles are different: (1) Sampling should be able to forecast an election on which no past data exist, like the first Indian election; or one where party alignments are obscure,² such as that in Texas and Mississippi in 1952. (2) Trend forecasting should theoretically be able to predict the 1956 election as soon as the 1952 results are in. In practice, polls have to make certain assumptions about continuing voter habits in framing their sampling schemes and devising questions or filters. Successful trend forecasters³ also take into account intervening events, such as economic conditions and third parties. Both may exercise judgment in selecting their formulas, they may change their formulas between elections, or they may use very complex formulas for deriving an estimate from their raw data. What is characteristic of "systematic" forecasting is that, once a formula is determined upon, "good judgment" on the part of the forecaster will not entice him to change it, no matter how absurd the prediction may appear.

1 For examples in both elective and administrative situations, see V. O. Key, Jr., *Politics, Parties, and Pressure Groups*, Second edition, New York, Crowell, 1950, pp. 571-583.

2 George W. Pearson, "Prediction in a Non-Partisan Election," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. XII, (1948), p. 112.

3 For example, see Louis H. Bean, *How To Predict Elections*, New York, Knopf, 1948.

The Partisan's Estimates

The party worker, though less systematic in his methods, less precise in his formulation of the problem, and freer to adjust his system, also utilizes the same sort of information. Presumably his experience in past elections serves as a standard, or norm, which he corrects to take account of current conditions, personalities of the candidates, new issues and registration figures. His conversations with voters and the reports his workers bring him are a variation of the sampling process. In regard to a third factor he is in a unique position: he knows the extent of his own and his workers' activities and their plans for getting the voters to the polls. Thus he may not only predict, he may partially control, the outcome. However, his personal involvement may bias his judgment: through the conviction that friends and neighbors cannot but see the rightness of his cause, through the compulsion to exude confidence in order to impress others, or perhaps simply because courteous friends and complaisant assistants hesitate to bring him bad tidings.

The practicing politicians from time to time have decried the efforts of the more detached systematists, preferring the reports of their own party workers on the firing line or their personal appraisals. The coincidence in 1936 of the failure of the Literary Digest poll, the success of the more systematic polls and James A. Farley's uncanny prediction of 523 electoral votes for Roosevelt provoked some comparative discussions.⁴

Although the verdicts were generally in favor of the systematists, party workers continued to rely to some extent on intuitive observers. The employment of confidential local informers, retail investigators and anonymous traveling observers, including "an old hack, whose political influence [was] so meager 'he couldn't carry his wife'," but who had "an unerring instinct for political evaluation," has been noted in southern gubernatorial races.⁵

Leslie Biffle's expedition through the Mid-west in the guise of a chicken-peddler has been credited with giving Truman an appraisal of sentiment in that area which sparked the 1948 whistle-stop tour that confounded the prognosticators.

The private predictions of astute politicians, when recorded for posterity, have not always been so accurate as Farley's. Roosevelt's own prediction in that year of 360 electoral votes was considerably short of the mark.⁶ So was his 1944 prediction: 335 to Dewey's 196 (Actual: 432 to 99).⁷

Except when they are either accurate or conservative, the private estimates of politicians are seldom available for the scrutiny of students. Their public, pre-election utterances, on the other hand, are quite sensibly regarded as whistles in the dark, and discounted at about the same rate as the pre-game pessimism of football coaches.⁸

The Survey Data

Two small-scale studies by the Office of Public Opinion Research make possible some comparisons of the systematic versus the non-systematic methods. Before two

4 See Harold F. Gosnell: "How Accurate Were the Polls?" Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. I, (1937), p. 97.

5 V. O. Key, Jr., Southern Politics, New York, Knopf, 1950, p. 404.

6 James A. Farley: Jim Farley's Story: The Roosevelt Years, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1950, p. 65.

7 John Gunther, Roosevelt in Retrospect, New York: Harper's, 1950, p. 351.

8 Why the leadership mores of these two fall sports should be so contradictory is an interesting matter for speculation.

elections - 1944 and 1950 - groups of experienced politicians of both parties were asked to do what the poll and trend forecasters attempt -- to predict the size of both parties' votes. The politicians selected were the county chairmen, and they were asked to estimate for the areas they were most familiar with -- their own counties. A telegraphic inquiry a few days before the 1944 election asked chairmen in barometric counties -- those whose past voting behavior had been representative either of the nation or their region -- to wire back the "best estimate of the division of vote" in their counties. Replies were received from both party chairmen in eight of the 12 counties selected. A mail survey just prior to the 1950 Congressional election consisted of a letter explaining the purpose of the experiment, signed by Hadley Cantril, Director of the Office of Public Opinion Research, and a questionnaire asking for the chairmen's estimates of the number of votes each candidate would receive. It also called for the chairmen to fill in the same figures for the 1946 and 1948 elections, in order to give them a ready and realistic point of departure for their predictions. The chairmen were assured that no political use would be made of their prediction, and in every other respect the communication strove to elicit a sincere estimate. The questionnaire went to chairmen in 296 of the 3070 U. S. counties, eight in each state, but none for Maine and nine Southern states where Republican opposition was only nominal. The counties in each state were selected on the basis of listings in the Gallup Political Almanac for 1948 to give a send-out evenly distributed from strongly Democratic to strongly Republican counties. Usable questionnaires were received from both chairmen in 13 counties. This is a small proportion of the send-out, and the process of self-selection subjects the sample to some unknown biases.

There is considerable difference between the estimate of the 1944 and 1950 groups of chairmen. This may be due to the fact that the former is biased in favor of counties that went Democratic by small margins, due to the method of selection, while the questionnaires mailed back in the latter case are from counties that went Republican by fairly large margins. It may also be due to a difference in the nature of the elections: 1944 was a wartime Presidential contest with Roosevelt a candidate, resulting in a clear Democratic victory; 1950 was a less stable year politically, a close contest with an equivocal outcome.

Geographically and by size, the two groups are more equivalent. Of the combined sample of 21 counties, three are in Iowa, two each in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, South Dakota and Oregon, one each in Michigan, Nebraska, Wisconsin, Montana, Wyoming, Washington, Alabama, and California. The size of the votes ranged from 700 to 116,000. One case where both chairmen estimated the township instead of the county, and one where they estimated the congressional district, were retained. Counties are not named here, to maintain anonymity of the chairmen.

While the purpose of the survey was to evaluate the accuracy of the chairmen's estimates, the resulting data may also be arranged to throw some brief glints of light on the judging processes that presumably go into the politicians' final estimates.

II. ACCURACY OF ESTIMATES

The chairmen's estimates are sufficient in number to make possible at least some elementary and tentative comparisons with:

TABLE I: PREDICTION AND ERRORS

Column 1 - Actual percentage Democratic of two-party vote.
 Column 2 - Percentage Democratic predicted by Democratic chairman.
 Column 3 - Percentage Democratic predicted by Republican chairman.
 Column 4 - Percentage Democratic in previous election (persistence prediction).
 Column 5 - Democratic chairman's error in percentage points (+ errors are overestimates of Democratic strength).
 Column 6 - Republican chairman's error in percentage points (- errors are overestimates of Republican strength).
 Column 7 - Persistence error in percentage points (+ errors overestimate Democratic strength; - errors overestimate Republican strength).

1944 Election

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
51.5	66.7	47.0	54.1	+15.2	- 4.5	+2.6
48.8	51.5	46.9	53.5	+ 2.7	- 1.9	+4.7
51.9	55.5	52.3	55.5	+ 3.6	+ 0.4	+3.6
51.4	51.0	44.5	51.1	- 0.4	- 6.9	-0.3
64.3	60.0	53.0	73.9	- 4.3	-11.3	+9.6
52.8	56.0	40.0	56.4	+ 3.2	-12.8	+3.6
60.1	60.6	52.0	57.5	+ 0.5	- 8.1	-2.6
55.9	58.6	47.2	57.1	+ 2.7	- 8.7	+1.2

TABLE II: 1950 Election

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
32.9	30.8	35.3	31.7	- 2.1	+ 2.4	- 1.2
33.2	40.0	36.8	27.9	+ 6.8	+ 3.6	- 5.3
35.6	40.9	31.6	30.8	+ 5.3	- 4.0	- 4.8
37.6	46.4	27.6	49.3	+ 8.8	-10.0	+11.7
38.0	51.7	46.9	40.8	+13.7	+ 8.9	+ 2.8
50.9	47.4	44.4	34.3	- 3.5	- 6.5	-16.6
36.8	52.9	45.9	28.1	+16.1	+ 9.1	- 8.7
47.8	66.6	47.1	58.5	+18.8	- 0.7	+10.7
37.9	50.9	43.3	35.3	+13.0	+ 5.4	- 2.6
54.4	53.9	44.4	49.8	- 0.5	-10.0	- 4.6
34.7	38.1	40.0	33.9	+ 3.4	+ 5.3	- 0.8
39.9	51.1	33.0	39.0	+11.2	- 6.9	- 0.9
38.0	51.4	34.2	27.1	+13.4	- 3.8	-10.9

TABLE III

Year	Area and No.	Estimate	Systematic Error	Standard Deviation
1944	State (48)	AIPO ²	-2.3	2.7
		Crossley ²	-1.7	3.0
		Persistence ³	-2.4	2.7
1944	County (8)	Dem. Chmn.	+2.9	5.2
		Rep. Chmn.	-6.7	4.3
		Persistence	+2.8	3.4
1950	County (13)	Dem. Chmn.	+8.0	6.9
		Rep. Chmn.	-0.6	6.5
		Persistence	-2.4	7.5
1950	Precinct (51)	AIPO	-0.5	8.9
		Persistence	-6.7	11.3

(2) Mosteller, et al., *op. cit.*, p. 61.(3) *Ibid.*, p. 66.

(1) The record of polling agencies. No available figures cover areas equivalent to counties but data exist for areas larger than the county in 1944 (state predictions) and smaller than the county in 1950 (precinct predictions), and these may be used to make comparisons, which are qualified to this extent.

(2) The record of trend forecasting. Since really sophisticated trend predictions would involve different formulas to fit the observed patterns in each county, it is necessary to represent these methods (with apologies) by the elementary "persistence" estimate -- i.e. a prediction that in each county the voters will turn out in the same numbers and split between parties in the same proportion they did in the election four years earlier.

Tables I and II give the raw data for these comparisons. In successive columns are set forth for each election: (1) the actual percentage Democratic of the two-party vote in 1944 and 1950 -- the mark at which the chairmen were shooting, (2) and (3) the percentage Democratic estimated by the chairmen, as derived from their predictions of the number of votes each party would receive, (4) the percentage Democratic in the previous elections -- utilized here as a persistence estimate, (5), (6), and (7) the percentage error of each of these methods of forecasting -- calculated by subtracting the actual from the estimated percentage Democratic. This method of calculation means that an overestimate by a Democratic chairman of his own party's strength appears as a positive (+) error, while an overestimate by a Republican chairman of his own party's strength appears as a negative (-) error. Reversing the sign of the persistence error also gives the equivalent of the shift in party strength between elections.

The average error (mean error regardless of sign) of chairmen's county predictions, of persistence for the county, and the error of polling organizations in their national estimates are:

	<u>Democratic Chairmen</u>	<u>Republican Chairmen</u>	<u>Persistence</u>	<u>AIPO*</u>	<u>Crossley*</u>	<u>Roper*</u>
1944	4.1	6.8	3.5	2.3	1.8	0.2
1950	9.0	5.9	6.3	0.7		

* Frederick Mosteller, et al., The Pre-election Polls of 1948, SSRC Bulletin, No. 60 (1949), p. 59.

The average error of the 42 chairmen of both parties in both elections is 6.7 per cent; of persistence for both elections, 5.2 per cent. The AIPO, in 245 state, national and local elections from 1936 through 1950, had an average error of 4 per cent.¹ Only 17 of the 42 chairmen were as close or closer than this, and only 16 came as close or closer in predicting their county vote than they would have done had they merely made a persistence estimate. Chairmen of the stronger party in each election appear to be more accurate forecasters.

However, it may hardly be fair to compare the polls' record for larger areas to the chairman's prediction for a single county, where election-day weather (to name one obvious local variable) could seriously disrupt his calculations at the last moment. Prediction for nations or regions permits these local situations to cancel out.

The "average error" computed above may also be broken down into its components: systematic error (the average of errors, taking sign into account) and the standard deviation of error (the variability that remains after systematic error

1 George Gallup, "The Gallup Poll and the 1950 Election," Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. XV, (1951), p. 21ff.

has been excluded). These two statistics have been calculated for the state-by-state predictions of two polling organizations in 1944. No state predictions were made in 1950, but the AIPO tested "pin-point" surveys in 51 precincts throughout the country. Two samples of 50 interviews were taken in each and the results combined. The precincts ranged from 200 to 1500 actual voters. Table III gives the errors of the chairmen, of persistence for state, county and precinct elections, and of the polling organizations where figures are available.

Thus in 1944, the chairmen's estimates for their counties had greater systematic errors and wider variability than the state polls or the persistence method for either county or state.

The 1950 election was a less stable affair. All the methods of estimation showed much wider variability than in 1944, but the chairmen were the least variable. The Republican systematic error was quite small, perhaps because this sample included a number of strongly Republican counties.

By all methods, variability increased as the area being covered diminished in size. For the polls, sample size may account for this.

Taking both parties and both elections into consideration, there is no evidence that the chairmen's judgments of the percentage division of the vote is any better as a predictive device than either of the two systematic methods.

If the 1952 election is as stable as the two studied here, a rank amateur should stand a slightly better than even chance of winning an election bet from his county politico if he simply forecasts that what happened in 1948 will repeat itself.

III. FACTORS IN THE CHAIRMEN'S JUDGMENT

By subdividing chairmen by party, by election, by whether they won or lost, by whether they were right or wrong in their prediction, and by whether they overestimated or underestimated their votes, some clues may be obtained as to the processes that go into formulation of these estimates. However, since the numbers in these subdivisions are small, the conclusions drawn from them will be, at best, tentative.

1. The Election Situation.

The 1944 sample consisted almost entirely of Democratic counties, due to the method of selection; the 1950 sample of Republican ones, because for some obscure reasons both chairmen in Republican counties chose to send back the questionnaires. This makes it difficult to separate the influence of party from the differential effects of election. However, it is not surprising that the presidential election is the less variable of the two. National personalities and issues have a similar effect on voters throughout the country, as demonstrated repeatedly in the "coat-tail effect" which sweeps members of the party of a successful presidential candidate into office along with him.

It is apparent that the unstable situation in 1950, as reflected in the variability of the persistence estimates, also had an effect on the chairmen's own predictions.

2. Party Bias.

One would expect that chairmen would have a bias in the direction of their own party. However, the difference in the systematic errors noted above denies a prevalent belief that an accurate estimate may be achieved by averaging, or in some other manner compensating, the bias of one party with that of the other.¹ A point midway between the two chairmen's predictions would have been better than the persistence estimate in ten of the 21 instances, worse in eleven.

3. The Local Balance of Power.

The fact that in both elections the eventual losers were more biased than the party that was to win suggests one major component of bias: unrealistic optimism on the part of the underdogs. This may be checked by dividing the chairmen into the 21 who had won the previous election -- the "in's"; and the 21 who had lost -- the "out's".

The biases -- in the case of both parties overestimates of their own strength -- and the variability of the two sets of estimates are as follows:

	Systematic Error (overestimate)	Standard Deviation
In's	2.3	7.2
Out's	6.7	5.7

4. The Pay-Off Point.

The fact that the bias of the "out's" is about three times as great as that of the "in's" suggests that the former are simply predicting a win for their own party. This is partially the case: of the 21 chairmen whose parties had won the previous election, not one of them forecast a loss in the coming one, although four were to lose. Of the 21 losers in the previous election, 12 predicted they would win this one. Three did, nine did not. The nine are the extreme instances of overoptimism in the face of facts; they are chairmen who placed their estimates just on the favorable side of the pay-off point--50 per cent Democratic. Their systematic error averages +13.5 for Democrats, -8.2 for Republicans.

It is, of course, impossible to separate genuine optimism from tongue-in-cheek estimates by chairmen who misunderstood the purposes of the survey or disbelieved the assurance that no political use would be made of results. If there were many of the latter, one would necessarily question the validity of the averages that have been computed. This problem might be solved in further investigations by another method of soliciting estimates, one which would give the chairman a greater involvement in his accuracy.

One chairman of this group of "out's" who were predicting a second defeat surprised himself and won. The remaining eight--five Democrats and three Republicans--are those who lost the last election, expected to lose this one, and did. Their forecasts should reflect the estimating process entirely free of the biasing effect of the pay-off point. The statistics for them are:

¹ This is a belief similar in some respects to the superstition that justice may be achieved when two opposing lawyers obscure the merits of each others' cases, or that the public may become informed by reading "both sides" of a controversial issue in, say, the Daily Worker and the Chicago Tribune.

	<u>Systematic error</u>	<u>Standard deviation</u>
Democratic chairmen	+4.4	3.5
Republican chairmen	-6.3	8.0

Their record is not strikingly better than the general run, although it is better than that of the nine overoptimists. Despite their realistic appraisal of their chances of winning, chairmen of both parties again overestimated their own vote.

The conclusion is that the pay-off point -- the goal -- has a real influence on the estimates, but that even those underdogs who expect to lose are still somewhat worse judges of the situation than the "in's".

4. Direction of Trend.

In ten of the counties the Democratic strength showed an increase over the previous year, in 11 it showed a decrease. Disregarding extent of errors, 28 of the 42 chairmen correctly appraised the direction of the trend. (Significant by χ^2 at .05).

5. Turnout.

Polling agencies at present do not estimate turnout by sampling devices. The AIPO relies in its national forecasts on extrapolating from New York (or some other large city) registration figures. The ratio of New York registration to national turnout in past years is plotted and projected to get a factor for the current year. This is an example of trend, rather than poll, forecasting. The errors, calculated as estimated-actual turnout in recent years have been:

<u>Actual Turnout</u>	
1946 (based on New York City)	-1.2
1948 (based on New York City)	-3.7
1948 (based on Minneapolis)	+1.9
1950 (based on New York City and three interim state elections)	-2.1

National predictions of this sort should be easier than local ones, for turnout is particularly affected by the vagaries of election day weather, which have no opportunity to cancel out. It may also be assumed that chairmen, subject to the wide differences in state registration systems, also had access to the best information about registration in their locality. Their average errors and systematic errors, compared with persistence are shown in the following:

	<u>Democratic Chairmen</u>		<u>Republican Chairmen</u>		<u>Persistence</u>	
	<u>Average</u>	<u>Systematic</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Systematic</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Systematic</u>
1944*	10.0	+8.8	1.4	+0.2	12.2	+12.2
1950	11.1	+1.8	13.2	+7.7	21.0	-13.9
Combined	10.9		10.5		18.9	

* Since some chairmen in 1944 gave their estimates in terms of percentage rather than votes, only four counties (eight chairmen) are represented here.

While chairmen in all four instances tended to overestimate turnout, winners' estimates averaged higher than losers'. Persistence is apparently an unreliable method of calculating the number of voters that will get to the polls.

6. The "Unmatched" Chairmen

Up to this point, the chairmen whose judgments have been considered are a "matched" group, with one Democratic and one Republican attempting to forecast the results in each county. From the 1950 sendout there were also usable returns from 74 chairmen whose opponents in the county attempted no estimate.

The sample is also biased in the Republican direction: 34 Democrats replied, 10 in counties which went Democratic in 1950, and 24 in counties which went Republican. Forty Republicans replied, 13 in Democratic counties, 27 in Republican. However, since many more counties are represented, the average of these chairmen may serve as a check on the smaller samples analyzed above:

	<u>Systematic Error</u>		
	74 "unmatched" Chairmen 1950	13 "matched" Chairmen 1950	8 "matched" Chairmen 1944
Democratic Chairmen	+5.7	+8.0	+2.9
Republican Chairmen	-0.7	-0.6	-6.7
	<u>Standard Deviation</u>		
Democratic Chairmen	7.6	6.9	5.2
Republican Chairmen	6.7	6.5	4.3

The larger sample does not differ appreciably either in the bias or the variability of the chairmen's estimates. On a simple win-lose basis, seven of the 34 Democrats were wrong (all in predicting a Democratic victory) and five of the 40 Republicans were wrong (four in predicting a Republican victory). This may be compared with five precinct polls wrong out of 51.

The difference between the 1944 figures and the 1950 ones, and the similarity between "matched" and "unmatched" chairmen in 1950 underscores the importance of the election situation.

IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Nothing in the two studies indicates that experienced politicians are more efficient than polls, or even simple persistence trending, in performing the task for which the polls are designed; i.e. estimating the percentage division between the two-party vote.

The estimates of county chairmen for their own counties were less variable than small (N= 100) poll estimates of the vote division in precincts, but, taking both parties into account, were more biased.

Averaging Democratic and Republican judgments on the theory that their biases would cancel out would not result in more accurate estimates than persistence. It is true that each chairman is biased in the direction of overestimating his own party's vote, but the bias of the underdog (regardless of party) is greater than that of his opponent.

The chairmen of both parties were clearly less accurate than persistence estimated in 1944, a stable election. In the 1950 elections for Congress, an unstable situation, the Republicans, who were strong in the counties sampled, made accurate estimates, but the Democratic estimates were badly biased.

Some of the chairmen's estimates were strongly influenced by the number of votes they needed to get a majority. But even those who saw no hope of winning were not demonstrably better than the more systematic methods of forecasting. The chairmen of the stronger party in one-sided counties turned in the best estimates.

The chairmen do a good job of estimating the direction in which the political wind is blowing, although they are poor at gauging its strength. And they are consistently better than persistence in dividing the number of voters who will get to the polls on election day. It may be argued that skill in both sensing direction and gauging turnout are functions which, to a party worker engaged in campaigning, have greater utility than the capacity to estimate precisely how the vote will divide.

Although an accurate estimate of the pre-election situation may give the chairman some information on which he can act, these studies suggest that an unrealistic viewpoint may in certain circumstances be an asset rather than a liability. To fill the role of a party chairman in an area where one's party is habitually in the minority may require a certain cheerful, blind, obstinate overconfidence in the face of repeated demonstrations of fact -- the "never-say-die" spirit.

How New Was The Old South?

By

JOHN K. BETTERSORTH

Note: This piece is adapted from an address delivered in May, 1952, before the annual convention of the Mississippi chapters of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, at Jackson.

It has often been the misfortune of the South to be misunderstood. Present-day critics who feel that the South can be talked, threatened or legislated into the millennium are among the worst offenders. However, we must admit that we Southerners who are so put upon by misunderstanding Northerners, have often done a very poor job of understanding ourselves. This can be explained in part by our sensitiveness to outside criticism, which has caused us to spend too much of our time explaining away our sins. But our failure at self-understanding can also be laid to just plain laziness, which we can blame both on the weather and on a tradition of wastefulness that has encouraged us to fritter away our time as well as our land -- and our money, if any.

At any rate, it behooves us Southerners to sit down now and contemplate ourselves honestly, without regard for the criticism of others. The essential philosophy of the state rights movements of the 1850's and of the 1950's is self-determination. We must examine ourselves in the bosom of the family, where one can be free to think things out, talk things out, and finally work things out. In this America, we have learned to do things by pulling on our own bootstraps -- and that even goes for the shoeless Southerners that certain estimable ladies in Washington once troubled themselves about.

So, let us consider our South over its full span of years. Is it a different South today from what it was in 1800, in 1850, in 1900? Two terms have come into the language whereby we attempt to describe the entire history of the South: the "Old South" and the "New South." What do these terms mean and are they properly descriptive of the South?

The "Old South" is ordinarily conceived of as the antebellum South, with its plantations, its slaves, its cotton and its so-called aristocratic society -- a way of living symbolized by moonlight, magnolias, and mint juleps. Today we know full well that all this was not the Old South at all. It is simply a South created by bad, or at least short, memories, sentimental novelists, and Hollywood directors. It is a South that was not. Certainly it was not the South that our fathers fought for.

Despite contrary legends, Southerners have always been a very practical people, and our ancestors of the Old South were of all practical people the most practical. They had to create an economic order rather than inherit it.

Out of land, Negroes, and cotton they evolved a system of earning a livelihood. Many of them were poor men's sons, like most of the first Americans; but they had dreamed the American dream. They came from all over -- Yankees from Maine, New York, and Ohio mingled with Southerners from the South Atlantic seaboard, and no one bothered greatly over which was which. In fact, many of the leading secessionists and no few of the prominent Confederate leaders were Yankee-born. It was war and so-called reconstruction that taught North and South to hate each other.

Again, the "Old" Southerner was no aristocratic snob, and whatever snobbery the Southerner has since exhibited was something he affected in evil days after all the other perquisites of aristocracy had been lost. No, the Old South was a new society, not an old one. It was a society that was a-borning, not a-dying. The bottom rail was forever coming to the top, for few there were who were content to stand upon the bottom rung of any social ladder. It was all this energy that built the mansions, managed the plantations, fought the duels over honor, and often exhibited a lively interest in the arts and literature.

There is a legend that the Southern planter was an administrative moron, depending upon overseers, factors, and bankers to see him through. There were, of course, some poor managers, as there are in all professions; but when one considers the fact that the slavery system, particularly in its last decades, was probably something less than sound economically, the miracle is that some planters apparently made money in spite of the system. In fact, the planter wanted to make money. He enjoyed spending it, and far be it from him to fail to take advantage of all opportunities. Foreign visitors even thought Southerners a bit nouveau riche.

No, the antebellum planter was a man who usually knew how to make money. And when times were bad he was willing to look for remedies either in scientific agriculture or in the balancing of agriculture with industry. In Mississippi it was a planter, Edward McGehee, who built our first railroad and one of our first textile mills. After all, the plantation economy was founded upon a desire to make money, and as such, it was one of our first great American capitalistic ventures, one of the first triumphs of free enterprise in America.

Another legend about the Old South that needs dispelling is the idea that it was a man's world, where woman existed only for ornamental purposes. Such a notion is hard to reconcile with the actual records, which show us a Southern woman who was surprisingly modern and refreshingly practical. She got herself "finished" in a female academy with the eminently practical objective of becoming attractive to the Southern male, who delighted in her physical charms and her superficial mastery of certain musical and pictorial arts. It was part of her practical wiles to be fought over and proposed over. Then, having found a beloved, did she retire to a pedestal as an adored but helpless female? No, she managed the household -- sometimes even the plantation (witness what happened in the Civil War). She nursed slaves and even undertook their religious training. She was, indeed, a clever woman -- useful as well as ornamental. It was some of her spoiled granddaughters who climbed upon the pedestals.

Yes, the "Old" Southerner was a practical person, not only in his personal affairs but also in his awareness of the world around him. Thomas Jefferson was interested in almost everything and a master of many things.

So was Mississippi's Sir William Dunbar. Science was no stranger in the South. It had brought the industrial revolution, which had made possible the Cotton Kingdom. In scientific agriculture it offered a solution to many of the South's agricultural problems. Even theoretical science was respectable in the Old South, which in the eighteenth century had prattled of rationalism and in the nineteenth century clamored for first editions of Darwin's Origin of the Species.

There is an ancient ditty about Southern letters which goes like this:

Alas for the South, her books have grown fewer

She was never much given to literature.

Never was there a falsier statement. Southerners of antebellum days read books by the hundreds -- they had the leisure to do it -- and they were exceedingly gifted in words, both oral and written. Most educated Southerners could write something -- even if it were only a doggerel poem or a friendly letter. It was simply one of the accomplishments of a man of parts. And the books they read were not just the novels of Scott. Even no less a critic of the South than the redoubtable Henry L. Mencken recognized this fact of old Southern life when he trained his guns upon our cultural barrenness in the 1920's.

It was after "the war" that Southern literature and Southern literary taste really deteriorated. What we wrote and what we read smacked of artificiality. It worshipped virgins and men in armor. Today the belle has been largely expelled from Southern belles lettres, and the man in armor has beaten his sword back into a plowshare; for Southern literature of today suffers few illusions.

The more one studies the Old South from the actual records, the more one becomes convinced of its essential newness, its enterprise, and its refreshing vigor. It is no wonder that such a breed of men -- and women -- could fight a war for survival and hold out for five years against tremendous odds. Their South was a South pre-eminent worth fighting for, too; for it was not a musty heirloom in an attic but a flesh and blood way of life.

But the Civil War was the tragedy of tragedies. It is one of the anomalies of war that it forces men who have created a way of life to give their lives to preserve it. And the South sent its best to the slaughter. Small wonder that when the war ended the South began to decline. The South's loss in slaves and real property was negligible as compared with the loss of its young men; for it was the future leaders of the South that had been wasted on the battlefield.

The miracle is that the South could ever have risen from these ruins. After suffering from the blow of losing a generation, the South did begin slowly to recover. In the last quarter of the nineteenth century the "New South" movement of Henry Grady heralded this revival. If the South could no longer be like its old self, it could at least ape the rich and successful North. So we went out in search of industry, a step symbolic of our having rejoined the Union. But still recovery was exceedingly slow, and even in our own day, the South has been rudely singled out as the nation's No. 1 problem.

But today the South is on the move again. Economic and social changes of great and far-reaching significance are in the air. The Southern planter is replacing the Negro with the machine, a development which bids fair to solve many of our problems. The machine, for example, will never be enfranchised, and it does not have to be bailed out of jail on Monday morning. We are also using machines in other areas than agriculture, and the migration of Northern industry southward has caused many a sleepless night above the famed line. But the gains are not merely material; they are also spiritual. Southern education is making great strides forward. A renaissance in Southern literature has been in progress for the last quarter of a century, and Southerners are making names for themselves in all spheres of cultural activity.

Yes, verily, a new South is at last upon us. But I wonder if this New South of today is any different in driving energy and spiritual vision from the Old South. I, for one, doubt it; for in essence the Old South was new, and in its newness was its real greatness. I am certain that the men and women of the Old South would be more at home in our South of today than some of us are.

Such patriotic Southern organizations as the United Daughters of the Confederacy are today witnessing something that has not been seen in the South since the days of the fathers of the Confederacy. Some of us may think that our obligation to the Southern past is solely to memorialize the military exploits of Confederate warriors. No, it is not for us to talk of battles and beat the drums for the fallen heroes but to memorialize the way of living for which our fathers died. So, let us forget "the war," as our fallen fathers have. Forget how they died and remember how they lived, for they possessed a zest for living that made the Old South great and will make the New South greater. There was a South that could never grow old because it was forever new.

Jefferson's Notes on Virginia

by

Robert A. Brent

NOTE: Herewith begins a series devoted to a discussion of various significant writings from the past---books whose undoubted "greatness" has been much advertised in certain academic quarters. The papers of which this series will be composed are the product of a faculty reading society formed at Mississippi State College in the spring of 1952. Each issue of the Bulletin will contain one of the series.

Mr. Brent, who holds his doctorate from the University of Virginia, is assistant professor of history and government at Mississippi State College.

In Thomas Jefferson of Albemarle County, Virginia, the United States produced one of the great men of world history. Perhaps to the casual student, he is best remembered as a member of the Second Continental Congress, whose pen in 1776 produced the American Declaration of Independence. To others he was one of the early, and perhaps greater presidents of the United States. Certainly these achievements alone would entitle any man to a secure place in the history books that every school-boy is forced to study during his formative years.

However to remember Mr. Jefferson for these accomplishments alone is to dwell on what were actually small, and perhaps even insignificant milestones in a life that spanned more than four-score years--years which saw thirteen struggling outposts of the British Empire turn slowly and reluctantly against the Mother Country, experience a steadily growing desire for the severance of ties with the Old World, fight for six long and trying years which ended with independence from the tyrannical rule of George III, years following this struggle which saw the weak and sickly American states almost founder on the shoals of an incompetent and helpless central government. This government was replaced in 1789 by a strong and powerful government which from the outset seemed to be tending in the direction of autocracy, and without Mr. Jefferson's constant sniping at Hamilton and other would-be protectors of the privileged classes, may well have resulted in the eclipse of what had started out as a noble experiment in Democracy. By 1800, the struggle with Hamilton's Federalists was over and Jefferson himself was entrusted with the position of Chief Executive of the still infant republic to nurture and continue to strengthen the idea of a government administered for the masses of the people. Following two terms as President with varying degrees of success, Mr. Jefferson was gratified to see the voters of the country continue in office his successors and political proteges Madison and Monroe. Thus it may be said that Mr. Jefferson's policies were in effect for a period of 24 years, during which time the United States had undergone a metamorphosis. In this process of change, certainly there was no more important figure than that of Mr. Jefferson of Virginia. At his death he could look back on a life that had been fully dedicated to the service of his country--a lifetime for which every American who followed him can be thankful.

To the political side of Mr. Jefferson's life there are many other accomplishments that are not nearly so well published. During the period in which he lived, Jefferson was perhaps the outstanding American architect. His own imposing residence

at Monticello, now a national shrine is tribute enough, but when one adds the many other houses in Virginia designed by this many sided genius, as well as his hand in the laying out of the capital city of Washington, and his crowning architectural achievement, the University of Virginia, it becomes apparent even to the layman that here was true genius. Much is made today of advances in scientific agriculture, but perhaps the present era of emphasis on such varied subjects as hybrid corn, the diversification of crops, or the regeneration of soils, was foreshadowed by the experiments carried on at Monticello during the years when Mr. Jefferson lived.

The Sage of Monticello was an inventor of no mean ability, having devised a duplicating process that enabled him to preserve copies of the important letters in his always voluminous correspondence. A new type plow, an indoor weathervane, a clock that ran for a week without winding, a standup writing desk, disappearing beds, and countless innovations all from the fertile brain that was always active in quest of simplifying and enriching daily living. Mr. Jefferson was an ardent and brilliant violin virtuoso, and there were many opinions that he could have made a lucrative living had it been necessary to fiddle for his daily bread.

As a political philosopher Mr. Jefferson must rank with the foremost that this country has produced. As the founder of the present day Democratic Party, he is revered by States-Rightists who profess a longing for a return to what is nostalgically known as Jeffersonian Democracy.

Certainly of all prominent Americans who have ever lived only Ben Franklin can be classed as a genius in so many varied fields, and even Franklin was not so versatile as the mild-mannered gentleman from the Virginia Piedmont, who might well be classified as an American counterpart of Bacon, Leonardo, and other Renaissance gentlemen.

Much has been said and written of the beginnings of democracy in the United States. Jefferson was not in any social sense a democrat, and only in a political sense by contrast with his contemporaries. A philosopher with a classical education, an exquisite taste, a lively curiosity, and a belief in the perfectibility of man, he was of the eighteenth rather than the nineteenth century. The extraordinary ascendancy he enjoyed in the hearts of the masses was attained without speech-making, military service, or catering to vulgar prejudices. The secret of Jefferson's power lay in the fact that he appealed to America's better half: her idealism, simplicity, and hopeful outlook, rather than those material, practical, and selfish qualities on which Hamilton based his policies.

Jefferson was sensitive but not sentimental. He loved birds and flowers but lacked a sense of humor, and hated the sight of blood. Unlike most Virginians of his generation he did not engage in field sports, and regarded dogs as a useless race, deserving extirpation. But he despised Rousseau's romanticism; and if he thought mankind perfectible, it was because Americans had advanced so rapidly in his own time. The dead hand of the past had been lifted from their government; then why not from their religion and society? And to all his other traits, this man was a finished politician as Hamilton and the Federalists found in the late 1790's.

If it be true that a man's writings betray him as he really is, Mr. Jefferson should be one of the best known figures in all recorded history. At the present time the Princeton University Press is undertaking the gigantic task of editing what is hoped will be the final edition necessary of Mr. Jefferson's correspondence. Still in the process of editing and publication, it is estimated that this edition will run to about 54 volumes of 750 printed pages each. Remembering that the typewriter is a rather recent innovation, it is comparatively easy to realize what a mountain of laborious longhand manuscripts this represents.

Yet despite his fluency with a pen, Mr. Jefferson is not noted as an author. His Summary View of the Rights of British America, his relatively hastily put together and frankly plagiarized Declaration of Independence, and his Notes on Virginia which was not intended for publication are the landmarks in his literary reputation. Of these works, certainly only his Notes ranks as a significant literary achievement in independent writing. This work coming at one of the low ebbs of Jefferson's political fortunes, the end of his term of governor of Virginia under a cloud of scandal in 1781, is worthy of study by not only those who would know more of the conditions that existed in the United States at the close of Revolution, but by students who would know more of the viewpoints of this truly remarkable man on almost every conceivable subject.

Mr. Jefferson's Notes on Virginia is significant not only for the insight it affords into the innermost working of perhaps the top intellect of the day, but it also represents perhaps the earliest portrayal of America to Europeans by an American. Numerous travel accounts and biased opinions of life beyond the Atlantic had appeared in England and on the Continent, but the European publication of Jefferson's Notes, even before it had been published in the United States, form an important milestone in American letters.

In 1781, Jefferson had finished his second term as governor of Virginia amidst rumors of cowardice and mismanagement of the state militia. Of all these charges he was later acquitted by the legislature, but he was disheartened and apparently determined to retire forever from public life and spend the remainder of his days at Monticello. But it was not in his nature to remain idle. A congenial task suggested itself. Some years before the Marquis de Marbois, Secretary of the French Legation had appealed to him for information concerning Virginia. The Frenchman had submitted many questions pertaining to the ancient Dominion, and Mr. Jefferson, with characteristic thoroughness and with no thought that his answers would be seen by any other eye than that of the Marquis, worked zealously and enthusiastically on the manuscript which was ultimately to appear under the title of Notes on Virginia. There is nothing to indicate that Jefferson, who found so much solace in his library entertained any aspirations to literary fame. His work as a writer had been confined to political polemics.

When, however, the request of the Marquis reached him, it found him not unprepared. For years, with his passion for facts and his love for the Old Dominion, he had written down from time to time, rough notes concerning his native state--notes covering every imaginable subject from botanical minutiae to political and geographical data. The request of the Marquis, coming at a moment of enforced idleness, offered the opportunity to assemble these voluminous jottings and whip them into literary form. Thus, owing to an accident and consequent confinement to his house, the notes were finally to be put into shape, and eventually, though quite by chance, were to be published as a book.

In the preface, written some years later, we are told that the book was written in the year 1781, "somewhat corrected and enlarged in the winter of 1782, in answer to questions proposed to the author by a foreigner of distinction, then residing amongst us." The subheads of the manuscript give an idea of the magnitude of the undertaking. They refer to boundaries, rivers, seaports, mountains, minerals, vegetables, animal products, climate, nature of the population, the military power of the aborigines, constitution and laws, colleges and buildings, religion, manners, and dozens of other diversified topics.

None of these subjects are treated lightly or superficially. The detail of the information given astounds the reader, especially when one realizes that the

Virginia of Jefferson's Notes includes the present day states of West Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky, as well as parts of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Wisconsin.

While the author is at his best in the more eloquent passages dealing with his political philosophy, the natural scenes which met his eye are lively descriptions indeed. From youth, Jefferson had found nothing more fascinating than the famous Natural Bridge, to which, throughout his life, he was accustomed to conduct visitors the eighty miles from Monticello. It was inevitable that an account of the bridge found a place in his chronicle:

Though the sides of this bridge are provided in some parts with a parapet of fixed rocks, yet few men have the resolution to walk to them, and look over into the abyss. You involuntarily fall onto your hands and feet, creep to the parapet and peep over. Looking down from this height about a minute gave me a violent headache. If the view from the top be painful and intolerable, that from below is delightful in an equal extreme. It is impossible for the emotions, rising from the sublime to be felt beyond what they are here; so beautiful an arch, so elevated, so light and springing, as it were, up to heaven--the rapture of the spectator is really indescribable.

In none of Jefferson's writings do his admiration and sympathy for the Indians appear so convincingly. His interest has been keen from his childhood, when the chiefs of the red men frequently paused at his father's house for refreshments, he made a study of their vocabularies, customs, character, their history and their origins. In the Notes, he presents an interesting theory as to their derivation. He was sure that even in ancient times, with their imperfect navigation, it had been possible and practical for Americans to have communicated with the Old World by water, going from Labrador to Greenland, to Iceland, to Norway. He regarded it as extremely probable that some of the inhabitants of the Western Hemisphere came by way of Asia, saying, "Asia and America, if separated at all, must be so by an extremely narrow strait." How unfortunate, thought Mr. Jefferson that the vocabularies of some of the Indian tribes had been permitted to become extinct. "Had these been collected and preserved," said Jefferson, "it might have been possible for scholars to have gotten a very good idea of the derivatives of this part of the human race."

More amusing is the vigor with which the author rushes to his attack on de Buffon, the famous French naturalist, whose world reputation at the time suffered considerably as Jefferson exposed some of his theories as founded on very hasty and often faulty fact. The naturalist who had never seen the American red man, and indeed very little of American life at all save what could be observed from imports to Paris, had vague ideas that Indians were smaller, less eloquent, less ardent in love making, and generally inferior in all ways to whites. Jefferson refuted all these theories by examples which tended to discredit Buffon even in his native France, and make him the butt of laughter at many a fashionable Parisian drawing room.

Inspired by his enthusiasm for the Indian, Jefferson hurries on to a description of their oratory, citing the pathetic protest of Logan, a chief of the Mingo tribe, whose family had been wantonly exterminated by the white man's cruelty in the prelude to Lord Dunmore's War in 1774. Jefferson says:

I may challenge the whole orations of Demosthenes and Cicero..to produce a single passage superior to the speech of Logan... to Lord Dunmore, then governor of the State. I beg leave to introduce it, first stating the incidents necessary to understand it.

In the spring of the year, 1774, a robbery was committed by some Indians on certain land adventurers on the River Ohio. The whites in that quarter, according to their custom, undertook to punish this outrage in a summary way. Captain Michael Cresap, and a certain Daniel Greenhouse, leading on these avenging parties, surprised at different times, traveling and hunting parties of the Indians having their women and children with them, and murdered many. Among those unfortunates was the family of Logan, a chief celebrated in peace and war, and long distinguished as a friend of the whites. Logan distinguished himself in the war which ensued...the Indians were defeated and sued for peace. Logan, however, disdained to be among the supplicants. But lest the value of a treaty from which so distinguished a chief absented himself should be disturbed, he sent by a messenger the following speech to Lord Dunmore:

'I appeal to any white man to say if he ever entered Logan's cabin hungry, and he gave him not meat; if he ever came cold and naked and he clothed him not. During the course of the last long and bloody war, Logan remained idle in his cabin, an advocate for peace. Such was my love for the whites that my countrymen pointed as they passed and said: "Logan is the friend of the white man." I have even thought to have lived with you, but for the injuries of one man, Colonel Cresap, who, in the last spring, in cold blood, and unprovoked, murdered all the relations of Logan, not even sparing my women and my children. There lives not a drop of my blood in the veins of any living creature. This called upon me for revenge. I have sought it; I have killed many; I have fully glutted my vengeance. For my people I rejoice at the beams of peace. But do not harbor the thought that mine is the joy of fear. Logan never felt fear. Logan will not turn his heel to save his life. Who is there to mourn for Logan?--no one.'

Fifteen years after Jefferson wrote the shameful story of the murder of Logan's family, and eleven years after the publication of the first edition of his Notes, he was ferociously assailed in the scurrilous columns of a Baltimore newspaper more noted for sensationalism and political bias than for accuracy, by Luther Martin, demanding the author's authority for the story, in behalf of two daughters of Cresap who felt that their family honor had been sullied. This attack was in the midst of what were perhaps the most bitter political struggles America has ever known, and Martin was a Federalist enemy of Jefferson. Since the column was clearly written for political purposes, and not out of tenderness for Cresap's daughters, Mr. Jefferson ignored the challenge to his integrity, and Martin wrote a second and even more violent diatribe, charging that Mr. Jefferson's purpose in the tale of Logan had been merely to prove a point, and solid evidence being lacking, he had manufactured evidence to illustrate the eloquence of the American red man, to the detriment of Martin's clients. This second attack was also ignored, but later in the third edition of the Notes, which appeared in 1801, under the personal supervision of the author, there was an appendix of nearly one hundred pages added which set out all the evidence bearing on the Logan affair testimonials from eye witnesses bringing out the truth of the matter as Jefferson had first related it. Jefferson, by this time, engaged himself in the same political controversy, the outcome of which shaped the destiny of America for generations to come, replied in a letter to Governor Henry of Maryland, complaining of the treatment he had received at the hands of political enemies in Maryland, and the obvious attempt to smear his honesty as a writer. It is apparent, even to the uncritical reader of that period that Jefferson's story was as accurate as was possible without actually witnessing the event himself.

Nor was this the only instance in the Notes in which the author was to find himself involved in controversy. We have seen him rushing in with fixed lance upon the then sacred Buffon in defense of the red man, but he still admired the works of the naturalist, and felt him, "the best informed naturalist who has ever written." Notwithstanding his admiration, he challenged Buffon's ideas on other subjects as well.

The Frenchman had written that in the case of animals known in both the Old World and the New, they were smaller in the New. He attempted to explain this on the theory that the heat in America is less intense than in Europe, and that more water was spread over the American continent and less drained off by the hand of man; and he asserted that heat is conducive to the production of large animals and water is adverse. To this Jefferson replied:

I will not meet this hypothesis on the first doubtful ground, whether the climate of America is comparatively more humid... because we are not furnished with observations sufficient to decide this question... The hypothesis after this question, proceeds to another -- that moisture is unfriendly to animal growth. The truth if this is inscrutable to us. Nature has hidden from us her *modus agendi*. Our only appeal on such questions are elaborated from the elements of earth, air, water, and fire. We accordingly see the more humid climates produce the greater quantity of vegetables. Vegetables are mediately and immediately the food of every animal; and in proportion to the quantity of food, we see the animals not only multiplied in their numbers, but improved in their bulk as far as the laws of nature will permit.

To bear out this statement, Mr. Jefferson then submitted a long table of animals common to both continents, setting forth their weights in contradiction to the fanciful assertions of de Buffon. The author was to carry this controversy with the French scholars to great lengths, basing his arguments on science, common sense, and personal observation. Indeed, later on, when Jefferson was Minister to France he confronted the French naturalist with positive proof of the incorrectness of his theory. Commenting on his table of animals and their weights, Jefferson pointed out that the tables showed eighteen quardupeds peculiar to Europe and seventy-four peculiar to America, and that the first of the seventy-four American animals weighed more than the whole column of the Europeans.

This controversy with Buffon was pleasant and free from any personal animosity, but he was less tolerant with the Abbe Raynal, another Frenchman who was prone to belittle the Americans. Was it not true asked the Abbe with a sneer, that America had not produced a poet or a great name in science or mathematics? Jefferson replied:

When we shall have existed as a people as long as the Greeks did before they produced a Homer, the Romans a Virgil, the French a Racine or Voltaire, the Englishmen a Shakespeare or Milton, should this reproach still be true, we will inquire from what unfriendly cause it has proceeded... In war we have produced a Washington whose memory will be adored while liberty shall have votaries, whose name will triumph over time, and will in future ages assume its just station among the most celebrated worthies of the world, when that wretched philosophy shall be forgotten which would have arraigned him among the degenerate of nature. In physics we have produced a Franklin, than whom no one of the present age has made more important discoveries,

or has enriched philosophy with more, or more ingenious solutions of the phenomena of nature. We have supposed Mr. Rittenhouse second to no astronomer living; and in genius he must be the first because he is self-taught. He has not indeed made a world; but he has, in imitation, approached nearer its maker than any man who has lived from the creation to this day. As in philosophy and war, we might show that America, though but a child of yesterday, has already given hopeful proof of genius, as well of the nobler kinds which arouse the best feelings of men, which call him into action, which substantiate his freedom, and conduct him to happiness...We therefore suppose that this reproach is unjust as it is unkind; and that of the geniuses that adorn the present age, America contributes her full share.

To another writer, more unbiased in his criticism, another name might well have been added to those of Washington, Franklin, Rittenhouse--the name of a close friend of the three, and in genius certainly second to none of them, the name of the pre-eminent philosopher of Democracy, Mr. Thomas Jefferson.

One of the important discussions in the volumes has to do with the institution of slavery in the United States in general and in Virginia in particular. Jefferson, with a great deal of justification, placed on England her full share of responsibility in the establishment and continuance of the slave system of labor. He noted that the Virginia legislature had at one time put an end to the importation of slaves, but a later King reversed the decision, and never again under the Royal Government had it been possible to enact such a law, although an attempt was made in almost every session of the legislature. Jefferson noted with glee that in the very first session of the republican government after 1776, a law was passed for "the perpetual prohibition of the importation of slaves."

While England may have been to blame for the continuance of slavery before the Revolution, certainly the Virginians themselves could only be blamed for its continuance after independent state governments were put into operation. Jefferson declared that the whole system was destructive, not only of the morals of the people, but of their industry as well. "In a warm climate," he wrote, "no one will labor for himself who can make another labor for him." Of all the slave holders, he added, only a small part are ever seen to labor for themselves. Mr. Jefferson's oft-quoted diatribe against slavery is almost classic:

...can the liberties of a nation be thought to be secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of people that these liberties are the gift of God? They are not to be violated but with his wrath? Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that his justice cannot sleep forever; that considering numbers, natures and means only, a revolution of the wheel of fortune, an exchange of the situation, is among possible events; and that it may become probable by supernatural events.

Some of Mr. Jefferson's critics could not believe that the Master of Monticello was indeed concerned with the plight of slaves, pointing that out as long as Jefferson lived.

What then of the slaves at Monticello? How could this be justified in the light of the author's views? Mr. Jefferson was a practical man, not a mere theorist as many of his political critics would have us believe, and he knew that nothing could be achieved by the freeing of a few slaves by the more humane of the owners. He was looking forward to the day when by common consent of the Common-

wealth, all slaves would be emancipated. Jefferson felt that this idea would come in time, but rather pessimistic as to when the event would actually transpire.

The author had several strong viewpoints to express on religion. That he was opposed to the combination of Church and State is too well known to all to need repetition here. His hostility did not mean as many of his critics claimed, hostility to the Anglican faith, but rather a plea for religious toleration. The first settlers to Virginia he pointed out were Englishmen, members of the Church of England, which had just triumphed in home territory with religions of other persuasions. As victors often are, these first Englishmen in America were just as intolerant with other faiths as their brethren in home islands. The Presbyterians, and especially the Quakers, were hounded and persecuted beyond belief, and several acts of the colonial legislature almost made it obligatory for other sects to flee the colony. Jefferson took great pride in the fact that during his two years as governor of the state from 1779-1781, all compulsory membership in the Church had been abolished, and Church and State were irrevocably separated forever in Virginia. So high a regard did Mr. Jefferson place on this achievement that later in life when he was writing his own epitaph, he listed this as one of the three crowning events of his public career, along with the writing of the Declaration of Independence, and his founding of the University of Virginia.

For his enlightened opinions on religion, Mr. Jefferson has been called unjustly by critics an atheist. This myth is one of the most persistent clinging to the Jeffersonian legend. Deeply religious without being ostentatious and churchgoing, his later Federalist enemies found his lack of regular church attendance, and his views on religion as set forth in the Notes on Virginia prime ammunition to be used in the heat of political campaigns.

On the matter of education, the author had many views to express. Though still in the early part of his public career in 1781, he spoke out for a system of public education that should be state supported and should produce the leaders of the state. From the system of state schools, from which no one should be barred for lack of funds, Virginia would benefit in greater leadership, and whatever expenses were incurred by the system would be amply repaid. The author was destined to live long enough to see only the top rung of his proposed educational ladder in operation, for primary and secondary education supported by the state did not become fact until long after Mr. Jefferson's demise in 1826.

The author's exquisite taste in architectural beauty is brought out in the Notes as he decries the tendencies of Americans to build their homes of wood, shunning as much as possible brick and stone. Not only were wooden houses warmer in summer and colder in winter, but Jefferson predicted that if the practice continued, America would present a new face every fifty years, as the rotting wooden structures were torn down and new ones erected. How much better he felt, to erect an edifice that could remain in the family for hundreds of years. Jefferson also decried the lack of taste of his countrymen, and longed for a return to classical simplicity, altogether uncluttered with ugly and unnecessary protuberances. Having just recently completed Monticello, but not yet having experimented further in architectural lines, this is one of Jefferson's earliest voiced opinions on the subject. Certainly his own work later in planning homes for his contemporaries showed that the passage of years did not shake his conviction in the simple, uncluttered, classical style of the ancient Greeks.

On the subject of war and military expenditures, Mr. Jefferson has never been classified as an expert, yet he had some strong convictions along such lines. As a philosopher, he could ruminate on how much better it would be for all concerned if

the expenditures made to secure a village, or fishing rights, or added territory, could be diverted instead to making roads, opening rivers, building ports, improving the arts, and caring for the poor. He could see little need for a land army of any size in America, since because of the oceans, in his own point of view, it would be useless for offense, and because of our isolation he could foresee little use for an army in defense of our shores. Our troubles, if there were to be troubles, would surely come on the seas, because on that element our vessels plying their peaceful trade would come into closer contact with possible rivals and foes. To abandon the ocean would, of course, be repugnant to the American people to whom commerce was a necessity. Thus it was essential that this country become strong on the seas. Mr. Jefferson did not advocate the building of a navy to challenge the might of the British fleet, but one strong enough to cope with whatever portion of the British fleet might be detached for purposes against the United States. Thus Jefferson, in early attaching importance to the American navy might well be considered one of the first to bring to the attention of his countrymen the absolute imperativeness of naval preparedness. In this thinking of Mr. Jefferson, there certainly is a lot of merit, but whether his views were altogether sound has aroused much dispute. Certainly later when the author was president, he did not carry out his views on a strong navy, desiring instead to economize on all government expenditures.

Perhaps of particular note to twentieth century moderns who are beset on all sides by rising costs of government, are some of Mr. Jefferson's views on the subject of government expenses and taxation. He states:

I should estimate the whole taxable property of the state (including incomes) at an hundred millions of dollars... One per cent of this compared with anything we have yet paid, would be deemed a very heavy tax. Yet I think that those who manage well, and use reasonable economy, could pay one and one half per cent, and maintain their household comfortably in the meantime, without alienating any of their principal, and that the people would submit to this willingly for the purpose of supporting their present contest. We may say then that we could raise, and ought to raise, from one million to one and a half million dollars annually...

Jefferson then figured that the government of the state could well be supported on one-half million dollars per year, leaving one million dollars that the state could contribute to the cause of the Revolution for purposes of raising and equipping a federal army, and other necessary expenses of the government. This federal government should then make it its business to "cultivate the peace and friendship of every nation, even of that which has injured us most." The United States today exacts between 25 and 30 per cent of income, and it makes one wonder whether it would not be beneficial after all to be allured to pay a tax as low as one and one half per cent of one's income.

In addition to the previously mentioned appendix citing his proof on the Logan affair, a second appendix sets forth a proposed Constitution for the Commonwealth of Virginia. The call had already been issued in the state for a constitutional convention to convene in the summer of 1783, and Mr. Jefferson was prepared to have some plan to present to the delegates as soon as they assembled. This proposed the regular executive, legislative and judicial branches of the government, but with some ideas that do not fit in with our thoughts on democracy today. In discussing the executive, the author proposed that the governor "shall be chosen by joint ballot of both houses of assembly, and when chose, shall remain in office five years, and be ineligible a second time." This would show that in the 1700's Mr. Jefferson was not at all sure that the masses of the people were qualified to

select their Chief Executive. The governor was to have a Council of State, presumably like the cabinet in later day usage, to advise him in all matters, but this was to be chosen by the legislature, and not by the executive himself. This fits in with the distrust of the time engendered by the high handed manner in which Royal governors had carried out the duties of their office. Voting for members of the legislature was to be confined to actual property holders of the state, or members of the militia, once again, not democracy in our present day usage. On these and many other points it is possible to glean glimpses of what later was to be perhaps the principal genius in guiding America along the democratic path. At this time it is quite evident that Mr. Jefferson was not at all sure that the people of Virginia were ready for the rule of the masses of the people. Later, especially during the 1790's when the bitter struggle with Hamilton's Federalists was taking place, Jefferson appealed to an ever widening electorate to defeat the aristocratic ideas of his opponents. However, to describe Mr. Jefferson as a real democrat is to ascribe something to him that never did exist, and to take credit away from Andrew Jackson, under whose influence the United States for the first time became a real democracy in any sense of the word.

It has been said earlier that there was no thought of publication when the Notes on Virginia was first written in 1781. At the time there were two manuscripts in longhand, one of which went to the Marquis de Marbois in response to his original request. Later Madison was loaned one copy for his private study and criticism. Upon reading, Madison was enthusiastic and suggested to the author that several hundred copies be printed and distributed to the students of William and Mary as a part of their education. Jefferson toyed with this idea, but found the cost of printing prohibitive, and there is great evidence that he altogether abandoned the plan until later, when serving as United States minister to France, he found the idea feasible because of lower printing costs. In the Spring of 1785 a careful revision was made, and a small edition was run off -- for private distribution. Unhappily, as it turned out one of the copies fell into the hands of an unscrupulous publisher in Paris, who desiring to cash in on the publicity of Jefferson's sparring of Buffon, made a very poor translation and hurried his work to the press. In the absence of international copyright laws as many other authors were to find later, there was nothing that Jefferson could do in the matter save suffer the tortures of any author who finds his work poorly translated. One real result of the pirated French edition was to enhance the reputation of the American Minister among the intellectuals in Paris, and to accentuate interest in the land of liberty across the sea.

Acting on the advice of Madison and other trusted friends, Mr. Jefferson in 1787 saw to the preparation of a carefully translated French edition that was published with his permission, and later to numerous public editions in English which appeared in both the United States and England.

Thus we have the major literary work of one of the giant figures of history brought to the world by a series of accidents. First the request of the Marquis de Marbois at a time when Mr. Jefferson was out of public life and actually seeking intellectual entertainment; secondly, the fortunate accident of an unscrupulous French publisher in publishing an unauthorized edition in French. This led Mr. Jefferson to the unescapable conclusion that there were a great many others throughout the world who were interested in what he had to say. The result was, of course, the later public edition published in English for his countrymen to read and enjoy in their native language.

Activities

NEW STAFF FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

Three new faculty members and two graduate assistants are now contributing to the program of the Social Science Research Center. They are William Buchanan, assistant professor of government, A. Alexander Fanelli, assistant professor of sociology, Raymond Payne, assistant professor of sociology, Anne O. Busby, graduate research assistant in government, and Willis Joe Robertson, graduate research assistant in sociology. Except for Dr. Payne, a portion of whose time is contributed to the experiment station research program in sociology and rural life and to teaching, the new personnel are full-time members of the Social Science Research Center staff. Mrs. Janie Wells Johnson is the new secretary for the Center.

Mr. Buchanan completed his undergraduate major in French and journalism at Washington and Lee and received his M.A. in English there in 1941. He was a reporter on Lynchburg, Va., Danville, Va., and Mobile, Ala. dailies, and a naval officer in Brazil, England, France and Germany before joining the faculty of Roanoke College, Salem, Virginia, in 1946 as instructor in English and publicity director. He was associate director of the Washington and Lee Bicentennial celebration in 1947-48, taking up graduate work in political science at Princeton in 1949, where he also assisted in research work for the Office of Public Opinion Research and for UNESCO. Mrs. Buchanan is the former Vivian Landrum of Picayune.

Mr. Fanelli received his B.A. from Dartmouth in 1946 after returning from a tour of duty with the Army Air Force in Aruba, N.W.I., and Alamogordo, New Mexico. He taught at Colgate in 1946-47 and returned to Dartmouth for his M.A. in sociology in 1948. A graduate student in sociology at Michigan from 1949-51, he served as staff sociologist at a summer camp for delinquent children. He returned to Dartmouth in 1951 to serve on the staff of the "Great Issues" course at that institution.

Mrs. Fanelli is the former Betty Van Dyke of Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Dr. Payne is a native of Lexington, Kentucky. After four years of experience in insurance adjusting and selling, and three years in the Army during which he operated the film exchange program for the occupation forces in Germany, he returned to the University of Kentucky. There he received his undergraduate degree in general agriculture in 1948 and an M.S. degree in Rural Sociology in 1949. He was a teaching assistant at Kentucky and at Cornell, where he received his doctorate in 1951. Last year he was assistant professor of sociology at the University of Oklahoma.

Mrs. Payne is the former Margaret Blanton of Winchester, Kentucky.

Miss Busby, a native of Okolona, graduated from high school there in 1938, and attended Mississippi Woman's College in Hattiesburg and Mississippi College in Clinton. She was a resident of West Point for three years and served as secretary to the director of flying training at Columbus Army Air Field. She worked as stewardess and administrator with Eastern Air Lines from 1946 to 1951, when she returned to complete work for her B.S. degree in Social Studies at Mississippi State. She graduated in August with honors, and now holds a graduate assistantship in the Center while working toward her Master of Science degree. She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Benjamin F. Busby of Artesia.

Mr. Robertson of Vernon, Alabama, is the son of Mr. and Mrs. W. E. Robertson of that city. He graduated from Lamar County High School in 1948 and from Mississippi State College in June, 1952. Mr. Robertson holds a graduate assistantship in the Social Science Research Center while working toward his Master of Science degree in sociology.

Mrs. Johnson is the former Janie Wells of Louisville, Mississippi, and the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. I. A. Wells of that city. She graduated from Louisville High School in 1950 and attended Draughon's Business College in Jackson. From 1951 to 1952 she was a secretary at Lyle Cashion Oil Company in Jackson. Her husband, John Johnson, of Weir, Mississippi, is a junior at Mississippi State College in the School of Education.

THE PROGRAM IN SOCIAL AND POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGY

In recent weeks staff members of the Social Science Research Center have held a series of discussions on the general topic of an appropriate focus for a long-term research effort. A constant consideration in these discussions has been to develop a program that would not duplicate or conflict with, but rather would complement the current, announced work of the Business Research Station. It has been felt that both the Social Science Research Center program and the Business Research Station's interest in "industrial problems" fall within an overall theme of research in "social, economic, and political change."

The general framework within which the Social Science Research Center plans to operate is the area of social change. The whole area of social change is a central one for the social sciences. This is not to say that change of any kind is important simply in and of itself; in fact, it would seem likely that change is primarily important because of its relationship to stability, i.e. that the answers to the questions "what changes? how? and why?" become significant only in relation to answers to "what persists? how? and why?"

Change may be studied on any one of several levels and within any one of several frames of reference, depending upon whether one is interested in political, economic, social, or psychological phenomena. The most fruitful results are expected to come from combinations of these. The level of analysis depends in some measure on one's conceptualization of the "whole" whose parts are assumed to be undergoing modification. For example, this "whole" may be the personality, the small group, the class structure or any one of a number of politicogeographic units. The proposal here is to take as a significant "whole" for investigation something which can perhaps best be labeled "community." Because of the varied referents which this term has had in the past, it is necessary to define it in the sense in which it is here being used, as an area-based social organization, composed of people and their service agencies in a contiguous area in which most people meet most of their needs and in which there is some feeling of attachment between the people and their service agencies.

Within this area early attention would be focused on those actions of individuals and of groups which are aimed at the "betterment" of community life in one way or another. It is obvious that such actions, especially when organized into programs, often originate in and receive direction and assistance from, sources and agencies outside the community. Consequently, any realistic study of local action would have to relate it to action at state, regional, or even national levels where such outside action was relevant to a particular situation. In studying such local action programs, the assumption is that they are part of a

movement of social and political change which is affecting the entire South. It is also obvious that such change is related to changes in the area of industry and agriculture, and that the line of research for the Center will tie in closely with parallel studies of industrial development by the Business Research Station. An attempt will be made to approach the study of local action with interdisciplinary methods and to make full use of the varied skills and knowledge of the personnel of the Center.

Within the area of social change, the Social Science Research Center proposes to focus on the more specific problem of local action. For research purposes local action is defined as individual or group action which maintains or alters the social organization of the community. One of the immediate limitations (as well as one of the challenges) of this research is that there is nobody of theory on local action to guide the investigator in the formulation of research problems and hypotheses. Consequently, it would seem not only advisable but necessary that the first steps in the contemplated research program be concerned with what are generally considered "formulative or exploratory studies."

The earlier studies in this program will be concerned with those aspects of local action which are relatively easy to isolate, for example, the actions of groups specifically organized to meet community needs. Staff discussions have developed general agreement on two main lines of research projected for the coming year: (1) a series of exploratory studies leading into (2) a series of more analytical and experimental studies of greater significance for the development of theory in this area.

Three exploratory studies are now being completed. One of these, of which William Buchanan is project leader, is an examination of the "Characteristics of the Mississippi Electorate." A. A. Fanelli and Raymond Payne are co-leaders for a "Census of Open-country, Neighborhood Associations in Mississippi, 1952." They are also collaborating on a "Census of community-development sponsoring agencies (parent organizations) in the South."

Soon to be undertaken will be a case study of local action in one or more Mississippi communities. Here an attempt will be made to build on the results of the more descriptive exploratory projects and to uncover some of the factors and processes related to "community action." Among factors to be considered are physical and human resources, psychological climate, social structure, communicative channels, and migration patterns.

T.V.A. LEADERS HERE TO DISCUSS RESEARCH

On October 21st, four officials of the Tennessee Valley Authority were on the campus to discuss the college research in the social sciences and engineering. They were R. O. Niehoff, director of training and educational relations, Lawrence Durisch and Steve Robock, both of the division of regional studies, and Mr. Dean, of the engineering research division.

EXTENSION RADIO-USE STUDY PUBLISHED

Farm and Home Education Through Radio, 1952, is the title of a study recently published by the Mississippi Agricultural Extension Service. Based on a survey of Attala, Coahoma, Oktibbeha, and Pearl River counties, the study was prepared by Mr. Herman J. Putnam, leader of field studies and training. An extract from this interesting study will appear in the December Bulletin.

COUNTY CHAIRMAN STUDY PUBLISHED

County Chairmen as Election Forecasters is the subject of a research study recently done for the Office of Public Opinion Research and Princeton University and published by the Social Science Research Center of Mississippi State College as Government Series No. 5 of Social Science Studies. The study is based on confidential pre-election estimates for 1944 and 1950 elections by 116 Republican and Democratic county chairmen throughout the country. It finds that the chairmen, subject to some exceptions, did not make any better estimates than public opinion polls; nor, as a whole, did they do any better than would an amateur who simply predicted that the county vote would split in a coming election just exactly as it had split in the last one. The strong points of the county chairmen were judging which way the political tide was swinging--though not how strong the tide was running--and in gauging the number of voters who would get to the polling booths. The study was written by William Buchanan, formerly with the Office of Public Opinion Research and now at Mississippi State, and Miss Virginia Zeraga of the OPOR staff at Princeton. A reprint of this study appears in this issue of the Bulletin.

JOINT SOCIOLOGY MEETING

The sociology and anthropology staffs of State College and the University held their fall semester meeting at State College in October. Major attention was given to planning co-operative research in population analysis and community dynamics and to the development of graduate training. In 1952-53, the Mississippi Program has eleven staff members of professional rank.

IBM TABULATING EQUIPMENT IN OPERATION

A central tabulating service, utilizing punched card equipment, has been established at Mississippi State College. This service is now available to all departments of the college for use in connection with administration, teaching, or research. Organized demonstrations will be arranged for classes in statistics and accounting or other instructional groups. The tabulating service office, located in Room 12, Lee Hall, is equipped with the following machines: alphabetical key punch, numerical verifier, class 402 tabulating machine, card counting sorter, and reproducing summary punch. At present the service does not have an interpreter, collator, or calculating punch. Many time and money saving applications of these machines to listing, statistical, accounting, sorting, computing, and writing routines, including various combinations of them, are possible. This service will grow in value as Mississippi State College continues to expand in the volume and complexity of its teaching, research, and administrative activities.

SOCIAL SCIENCE BOOKS PURCHASED

A number of new books are being added to the John Melvin Wright collection in the Mississippi State College Library. Mr. Wright's widow recently sent a check for \$150, which will be used for social science books, as requested in Mr. Wright's will. After he died in 1937, his widow notified the college that he had left a bequest of \$1,000, the income from which to be used in the purchase of social science books for the State College Library. She also sent several hundred books from her late husband's library. Several annual additions have been made to the collection, which is a part of the books available to students and faculty in State's million dollar Library. Mr. Wright was an attorney in Washington, D.C.

He was graduated from Mississippi State in 1924, then received a degree from the Harvard University Law School. As a student at State, Mr. Wright was editor of Reflector and a debater, and in his senior year he won the state oratorical contest held at Ole Miss. He was also prominent in social and religious activities.

CENTER SPONSORS COMMUNITY FORUMS

A unique form of cooperation between the college and the community in Mississippi has been undertaken by the Social Science Research Center of Mississippi State College, which is sponsoring a series of lecture-discussions for the West Point Community Forum. The first speaker in this forum series was William J. Evans, Professor of Government at Mississippi State College, who led a discussion on the subject, "Presidential Politics from Convention to Electoral College." The session was held in the auditorium of the East Side Elementary School on October 14th.

The series of lectures, which will continue through the winter and spring, will include a postmortem discussion of the 1952 presidential election by Professor William Buchanan, who came to the Social Science Research Center from the Princeton Institute of Public Opinion. Other addresses will be given by Dr. R. A. Brent, who will discuss the topic, "The United Nations--Vision or Nightmare;" Dr. J. K. Bettersworth, who will speak in February on the policies of the new administration; Professor A. A. Fanelli, who will deliver an address entitled "Inside Time, A News Magazine and the Public," and Mr. H. P. Todd, of the Agricultural Experiment Station, who will discuss Mississippi's industrial potentials.

COUNTY REVENUE STUDY CONTINUES

Dr. G. K. Bryan is now assembling data for a study of county revenues and expenditures in Mississippi for 1951. The study is sponsored by the Social Science Research Center and will be supported in part by the Board of Trustees faculty research funds. The project involves a detailed study and analysis of the revenues and expenditures of each county in the State for the fiscal year 1951. This entails a careful compilation of data and 48 separate computations of percentages for each of the 82 counties in Mississippi. In turn, this information must be analyzed to show significant facts relative to the comparative importance of each revenue source and each type of expenditure; and then the information must be presented in language which can be understood by the average citizen. In this way the citizen should get a clear picture of what his county government does and how its program is financed.

Such information in the hands of citizens as well as officials of the county should materially contribute to the solution of the problems confronting the state and county governments in Mississippi. Each year finds the people of Mississippi searching for ways by which to finance an ever-increasing program of public service without unduly burdening the taxpayer, and information such as that to be supplied by this study should be of great assistance in this endeavor. An enlightened people is a basic necessity in a democratic system of government.

EVANS PREPARING A CITIZEN'S HANDBOOK

With the assistance of faculty research funds provided by the Board of Trustees, W. J. Evans is preparing a Citizen's Handbook for Mississippi. This study is

designed to reduce to a layman's understanding the pertinent laws and administrative regulations of the state of Mississippi affecting the citizen in his relations with his state and local government. Subjects to be covered are: political parties and elections, town and county governmental organization, jury duty, health, highways and traffic matters, and education. The handbook will be so written that it may be used by public schools and civic clubs as a special study course. The ultimate objective of the study is the creation of an enlightened and interested citizenry capable of discharging adequately its duties and obligations under government. The first portion of this study will appear shortly. It will deal with suffrage and political party organization.

HEALTH AND WELFARE WORKSHOP HELD ON CAMPUS

On October 29, a Health and Welfare Workshop was held at State College. The meeting was sponsored by the College Committee on Community Development, of which Professor Dorris Rivers is chairman. Present at the workshop were representatives of eleven agencies and organizations rendering health and welfare services in Mississippi.

At the morning session, Dr. S. K. Johnson of Pelahatchie, Chairman of the Rural Health Committee of the State Medical Association, reviewed the activities of this committee, which has attracted nationwide attention. Dr. Johnson stressed the need for better trained rural physicians, for proper recognition of the small clinic, and for facilities to care for incurables or convalescent homes. Also at the morning session a discussion of the work of the Social Science Research Center was led by Mr. Alex Fanelli and Dr. Raymond Payne. They pointed out the relations of community research to the problems of health and welfare programs. Mrs. Anna Lloyd, on loan to Mississippi from the Kellogg Foundation, briefed the group on the recruitment and training program for practical nurses. Since the initiation of this service, two training centers for white nurses and one for Negro nurses have been established. Miss Katie Lou Lord, who is chairman of the Mississippi Nurses Association, very ably presented the needs and opportunities of this profession in Mississippi.

In the afternoon, Miss May Cresswell and Mr. Dorris Rivers discussed the role of Extension Service in Community Development. It was urged that all agencies and organization having community services to render join in the concerted effort of Community Development. Dr. Marion T. Loftin of the Department of Sociology and Rural Life gave a summary of the findings of the Four-County Studies made in "Utilization of Health and Welfare Services." All agencies present made a report on new programs of interest. Among those represented were vocational education, rehabilitation, public welfare, children's code commission, public health, school health, vocational guidance, Mississippi Medical Association, hospital association, Extension Service, and others.

Individual Activities

CAMPUS

MR. GRADY B. CROWE of the Delta branch experiment station attended a mechanization conference at Bakersfield and Fresno, California, on October 22-25. He is presently preparing a report entitled "Chemical Weed Control in Cotton - Cost and Performance."

DR. DOROTHY DICKENS, head of the home economics department in the Experiment Station, is the representative of the Home Economics Division of the Land Grant College Association on the Experiment Station Research Marketing Advisory Committee at Lexington, Kentucky. She is the author of Experiment Station's Bulletin, No. 490, Housing of Farm - Owner - Operator Families in the Mississippi Lower Coastal Area.

CHESTER M. WELLS, JR., of the agricultural economics department, attended the American Farm Economic Association's annual conference held at Urbana, Illinois, on August 28-30. He was also present at the annual Spinner-Breeder conference on September 1-2 at Greenville, Mississippi. He is engaged in a study of the cost of performing warehousing and central marketing services in marketing cotton in the Delta.

MR. J. V. PACE, leader of the extension economics, attended the National Agricultural Outlook Conference in Washington, D. C., on October 20-24, where he assisted in preparing the 1953 agricultural outlook information. He also attended the 1952 annual meeting of the Negro extension agents at Jackson College on November 4, where he discussed the provisions of Livestock, Poultry and Egg Production Assistance Act of 1952 and then discussed the extension farm and home planning program and the 1953 farm and home outlook.

RUPERT B. JOHNSTON has joined the agricultural extension economics department and is handling the details of the livestock and poultry production program under the Mississippi Livestock, Poultry and Egg Production Assistance Act of 1952. Mr. Johnston received his B.S. degree in agricultural economics at Mississippi State with honors in the class of 1950. He received a fellowship to do graduate work in agricultural economics and earned his Master's Degree at State in 1951. Mr. Johnston comes to the extension service from the State College agricultural economics staff, where he did research work and teaching during and following his graduate work.

MR. CHAS. L. CARY, formerly county agent in Sharkey County and for the past several years with the Extension marketing department, has joined the Extension economics department. He is in charge of the state-owned institutional farm program, in which the Extension Service advises with and assists state-owned institutions that operate farms in developing sound long-time land use, and food and feed production programs, as specified in Senate Bill 170 and House Bill 951 of the 1946 Legislature. Mr. Cary also advises with the institutional farm managers on all farm management and conservation problems in connection with the operation of the farms.

WARREN E. COLLINS, of the department of agricultural economics, attended the American Farm Economics Association at Champaign, Illinois, on August 27-30, where he read a paper entitled "Interregional Competition in Dairying."

DONALD E. THOMPSON, director of libraries, attended the Mississippi Library Association meeting at Jackson on October 2-4. He is compiling a catalogue of M. S. Theses for Mississippi State College from the beginning of graduate work through 1952, which he expects to have ready within a few months.

MISS ESTHER F. SEGNER, of the homemaking education department, attended district homemaking teachers' conferences at Jackson on October 14, at State College on October 15, and at Cleveland on October 28. At each meeting she gave a discussion on ways of making teaching family-centered. She is editing the resource units for the Mississippi Homemaking Teachers' Guide.

PROFESSOR WILLIAM P. CARTER, sociologist, attended a marriage counseling workshop in Los Angeles for two weeks in August, where he participated in many discussions, observed demonstrations of marriage counseling, and did some marriage counseling himself. On October 21, he showed the family film, "Angry Boy," to the Greenwood P. T. A. with a preliminary discussion of some of the problems in rearing children.

LOUISE WHITLOW, of the industrial education department, attended the national convention of Delta Kappa Gamma in Chicago on August 12-16 as a delegate from the Lewndes-Oktibbeha-Clay chapter. She later attended the state Delta Kappa Gamma workshop in Jackson on September 27 and participated in the afternoon program. She is serving her second year as president of Alpha Chapter of Delta Kappa Gamma.

JOHN J. MacALLISTER, of the department of institutional and industrial management, and DEAN R. C. WEEMS attended the American Hotel Association in St. Louis on October 6-11. Dean Weems addressed the convention on October 9 and outlined and explained the American Hotel Institute, a nation-wide program for hotel employees which will be headquartered at Mississippi State College under the supervision of the department of institutional and industrial management. Mr. MacAllister was named director of the American Hotel Institute.

LEE B. GAITHER, head of the department of resource-use education, attended a conference on "Progress and Gaps in Conservation Education" at Purdue University on September 15-16, which was called by the Conservation Foundation at the request of the Ford Foundation. On September 17-19, he participated in a three-day workshop on "Conservation Education and Resource-Use Education" at Purdue University by request of the National Committee on Policies in Conservation Education. He also served as one of the participants on a panel on "Resource-Use Education Workshops."

JAMES H. McLENDON, of the history and government department, will attend the annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association and the Southern Political Science Association on November 5-8. At the political science meeting, he will speak on "Party Organization in Mississippi: Effects of the Campaign of 1952." His study of the Democratic convention and campaign in Mississippi for the American Political Science Association will be completed in December. His review of Vann Woodward's Origins of the New South, 1877-1913, appeared in the Southwestern Historical Quarterly for October, 1952. He has been appointed to the Special Projects Committee of the Mississippi Historical Society. He is the Business School representative on the Program Committee for the 75th Anniversary Celebration of the founding of Mississippi State College.

DR. ROSCOE J. SAVILLE, head of the agricultural economics department, attended the International Conference of Agricultural Economists held at Michigan State College, August 15-22.

In the agricultural economics department, LEWIS P. JENKINS and THOMAS E. TRAMEL are on leave for advanced study at Iowa State College. Both received General Education Board grants to help support them while on leave for this work. CHESTER M. WELLS, JR. and EDWARD E. KERN, JR. have returned to duty after being on leave for advanced study last year. Mr. Wells was at the University of Illinois and Mr. Kern at the University of Kentucky.

DR. HARALD A. PEDERSEN and A. ALEXANDER FANELLI attended the conference on Pre-Professional Education for Social Work, October 24-25 at Mississippi College.

DR. HARALD A. PEDERSEN, DORRIS W. RIVERS, and DR. MARION T. LOFTIN attended the Rural Sociological Society Meetings at Penn State, and the American Sociological Society Meetings at Atlantic City on August 29 through September 5.

DR. HARALD A. PEDERSEN has contributed an article, "Attitudes Relating to Mechanization and Farm Labor Changes in the Yazoo-Mississippi Delta," which will be published by Land Economics in a forthcoming issue. Dr. Pedersen represented the American Association of University Professors at the inauguration of President Hogarth at Mississippi State College for Women on October 24.

HAROLD F. KAUFMAN and ROBERT F. GALLOWAY are authors of The Use of Hospitals by Rural People, soon to be published by the Mississippi Agricultural Experiment Station.

ROBERT A. BRENT is representing the University of Virginia at the inauguration of Dr. F. P. Gaines as President of Wofford College, November 14. He addressed the Starkville Exchange Club on October 7 on "The Genocide Treaty" and the Rotary Club on October 24 on "The United Nations." On November 3, he appeared on a radio program on the United Nations over station WSSO.

GORDON K. BRYAN, of the history and government department, will attend the annual meeting of the Southern Political Science Association on November 5-8. He will participate in a panel in which he will discuss "The Place of the States in American Government." His study, County Revenues and Expenditures in Mississippi, 1950 was published in July. An article, "County Revenue System in Mississippi," appeared in The County Officer, in May, 1952. He is now engaged in a study of county revenue and expenditures for 1951. He is also engaged in a study of county government for the Mississippi Economic Council. Among recent addresses were talks to the Starkville Women's Club and the Pilot Club.

G. L. SWITZER, assistant forester, is co-author with G. M. Judson of the U. S. Forest Service of an article in Mississippi Farm Research for October, 1952, on the marketing of timber products in northeast Mississippi. The article reports the results of a two-year study of the marketing system used for forest products in a 17-county area and suggests means of improving the timber economy of the region.

R. T. CLAPP, head of the forestry department, represented Pomona College, Claremont, California, at the inauguration of Dr. Charles P. Hegar as President of Mississippi State College for Women, in Columbus, October 24, 1952.

W. E. CHRISTIAN, JR. of the agricultural economics department attended a national marketing workshop at Texas A. & M., July 11-19. He served as chairman of a work-group, discussing "Pricing at Various Stages of Marketing." He also attended the fifth annual Grain Marketing Symposium, sponsored by the Chicago Board of Trade, September 11-12. On September 17-18, he attended a meeting of Southern Regional Livestock Marketing Technical Committee at Atlanta.

O. T. OSGOOD, professor of agricultural economics, is preparing the manuscript for an Experiment Station Bulletin, Adapting Farm Plans to Farm Resources on Upper Coastal Plain Soils. Production practice data being used in the report are by soil groups as set out in the Experiment Station Technical Bulletin No. 32, The Land-Use Pattern Scale Method of Land and Farm Classification. Farm plans presented are being established on farms cooperating with the College Balanced Farming-Test Demonstration Program.

DR. GLOVER MOORE's book on The Missouri Controversy is seen to be published by the University of Kentucky Press. He has recently donated a number of books dealing with southern history and literature to the college library and a number of children's books to the colored school of Starkville. Dr. Moore appeared on a panel on election issues at the Starkville Women's Club on October 27.

THOMAS A. KELLY, of the Business Research Station, was in Atlanta, October 3-4, as a delegate to Southern Regional Board conference on statistics, curriculum section. On October 13, he attended the annual meeting of Mississippi Research Clearing House. Dr. Kelly is currently at work on a case study of the availability and efficiency of working forces in Mississippi manufacturing plants. This is a pilot study to be published early in 1953.

MARGARITE PEEBLES, of the library, attended a meeting of the Mississippi Library Association on October 2 at Jackson, where she spoke on "Audio-Visual Materials." At the Mississippi Hospital Association on October 16 at Jackson, she participated in a panel discussion with five other hospital trustees on "Strengthening the Hospital Through Trustee Education."

"Investment Programs for College Professors" was the subject of a talk by DR. R. C. WEEMS, JR., at the October 27 meeting of the Y Faculty Club. Dr. Weems is dean of the School of Business and Industry.

DR. JOHN K. BETTERSORTH attended a reorganization meeting of the Mississippi Historical Society at Jackson on October 3. He was appointed chairman of the editorial committee, whose purpose is to make recommendations concerning the Journal of Mississippi History. Dr. Bettersworth was recently notified that his biography will appear in the second edition of Who Knows and What, a Marquis publication. The manuscript of his History of Mississippi State College has gone to the printer and is scheduled to be published in May, 1953, by the University of Alabama Press. Dr. Bettersworth has recently participated in historical marker ceremonies at Mississippi City and Pascagoula. On October 28, he addressed the Starkville Civic League on the issues of the presidential campaign. On October 7, he attended the meeting of the Mississippi Research Clearing House at Hattiesburg. On November 5-8 he will attend the annual meetings of the Southern Historical Association and the Southern Political Science Association.

HARRY L. COLE, of the Public Relations department, gave addresses on presidential campaign issues at meetings of the Octec Home Demonstration Club on October 12 and the Sessums Home Demonstration Club on October 14.

WILLIAM HAL ROBBINS, of Meridian, has been appointed graduate assistant in government. Last year he was awarded the James W. Garner scholarship.

PAUL T. BLAIR of Hamilton; PAUL O. MOHN of Marion, Kansas and JONATHAN DAVID JONES of Brunswick, Tennessee, have been re-appointed graduate assistants in the agricultural economics department.

LANGDON UNGER of Meridian has been appointed graduate assistant in history.

DR. HAROLD F. KAUFMAN, Thomas L. Bailey professor and head of the division of sociology and rural life at Mississippi State College, is on leave during the winter in order to serve as visiting lecturer in sociology at Columbia University. At Columbia, he is conducting a research seminar for students who are writing their theses, and he will give a lecture course in community. He is also working with Dr. Edmund des Brunner, internationally known sociologist and adult educator, in a seminar on rural life. Dr. Kaufman will return to the campus late next May. During his absence, Dr. Harald A. Pedersen is serving as acting head of the division of sociology and rural life and acting associate chairman of the Social Science Research Center.

DR. MELVIN L. GREENHUT joined the State faculty this fall as associate professor of economics. He received his bachelor's degree at Hofstra College, New York; and his master's degree and his Ph.D. at Washington University, St. Louis. A World War II veteran, he taught economics at Auburn for three and a half years. Last year he served as head of the office of Price Stabilization in Birmingham, Alabama.

DR. RAYMOND PAYNE has been appointed assistant professor of sociology and rural life at Mississippi State College. He received his B.S. in 1948 and his M.S. in 1949, both from the University of Kentucky; and his Ph.D. from Cornell University in 1951. He served as assistant professor of sociology at the University of Oklahoma 1951-1952 and he taught at the Southern Regional Extension School at the University of Arkansas this summer.

NEIGHBORING INSTITUTIONS

RAYMOND W. MACK will join the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at the University in February as Assistant Professor of sociology to develop a teaching and research program in urban-industrial sociology. Mr. Mack is now completing his doctorate at the University of North Carolina, where he has been an instructor, research assistant, and for the last two years, Research Fellow in the Institute for Research in Social Science, being engaged in contract research for the Air Force.

ROBERT L. RANDS and the Sociology department of the University are participating in the Lower Mississippi Survey together with the Peabody Museum of Harvard, the American Museum of Natural History, the University of Michigan and Louisiana State University.

MISS EMMA RUTH CORBAN of Meridian Junior College participated in a panel discussion on "Problems of Alcohol Education" on October 8 at the annual meeting of the Association for the Advancement of Instruction about Alcohol and Narcotics at the Jefferson Hotel, Richmond, Virginia. The association had a joint meeting with the National States' Conference on alcoholism.

LEON A. WILBER, professor of social studies at Mississippi Southern College, attended the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association at Buffalo, New York, August 26-28. He has been conducting an analysis of the Republican conventions in Mississippi and the ensuing campaigns, in connection with an American Political Science Association nation-wide study.

At Mississippi Southern College MR. JOHN F. NAU, M. A., Tulane, with graduate work at University of South Carolina, is assistant professor of Religion and Philosophy replacing Dr. H. B. Vinnedge, new head of Keble College at Pass Christian. Mr. Nau is working on his dissertation, the title of which is "The Germans of New Orleans, 1850-1900." MR. H. W. RODEMANN has returned as assistant professor of history after a year of graduate study at the University of Chicago. He passed his preliminary examination for the doctorate this summer at Chicago.

DR. ROBERT H. SPIRO, JR., professor of History at Mississippi College, is now completing a series of articles on John Loudon McAdam, early 19th century British industrialist and engineer, who gave his name to a type of hard-surfaced road. He also contributed a review of M. W. Schlegel's Conscripted City: Norfolk in World War II to the Journal of Southern History, August, 1952.

JULIEN B. TATUM of the sociology department of the University of Mississippi participated in a round table on world health at the annual meeting of Tennessee State Nurses Association on October 16.

LUCILLE PEACOCK, librarian of the Evans Memorial Library at Aberdeen, Mississippi, has recently completed a Local History Work Book for Elementary Grades and a Guide to Manuscript Collections in the Evans Memorial Library. A member of the Mississippi Genealogical Society, she has contributed articles on "Local Mississippians" to the Antiquarian Bookman (January 5, 1952); on "Broadcasting is Fun" to the Library News (June, 1952); and "March of Monroe County, Mississippi Families" to Genealogical Helper.

LOLON T. KIMBALL, of the sociology and anthropology department of the University of Alabama, was recently elected president of the American Society for Applied Anthropology. Dr. Kimball reports major research contracts recently made with the Health Information Foundation, the American Nurses Association and the Human Relations Research Institute at Maxwell Field. On the Alabama Sociology staff, DR. MARION PEARSALL, anthropologist, has replaced Dr. Bart Landhur, who resigned to become librarian at the Hague.

DR. R. A. McLEMORE, of Mississippi Southern College, attended a meeting of the Association of Urban Universities at Detroit, October 27-28. He was a delegate to the inauguration of President Ellis Finger at Millsaps College on October 30. He will attend the Southern Historical Association meeting, November 6-8, at Knoxville. An article, "Mississippi in 1951" will appear in a forthcoming issue of the Journal of Mississippi History.

LULA MAE FOWLER, of Hinds Junior College, attended a family financial security education workshop at Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas, July 14 - August 8, 1952.

CAROL BRUMBY, associate professor of geography at Delta State Teachers College, attended a meeting of the International Geographical Union on August 8-15 at Washington. She was also present at meetings of the Association of American Geographers and the National Council of Geography Teachers at Washington on August 6-7. At the teachers meeting she participated in a committee study of "Research in Geographic Education." She also attended the conference on Pre-Professional Training for Social Work at Mississippi College.